A. ISKENDEROV

AFRICA

POLITICS
ECONOMY
IDEOLOGY

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS MOSCOW

A. ISKENDEROV

AFRICA

POLITICS
ECONOMY
IDEOLOGY

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *G. Ivanov-Mumjiev*
Designed by *S. Danilov*

А. Искендеров.

**АФРИКА:
ПОЛИТИКА,
ЭКОНОМИКА,
ИДЕОЛОГИЯ**

На английском языке

First printing 1972

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 5

THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION—A PART OF THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS 13

MOTIVE FORCES OF THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION . . 36

STRUGGLE FOR ECONOMIC EMANCIPATION 63

KEY PROBLEM OF NEWLY-INDEPENDENT AFRICAN STATES 96

SOCIALIST TRENDS IN AFRICA AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM 119

AFRICA AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE TWO SYSTEMS . 145

This book deals with the problems the newly-independent African countries are meeting with in their development. It is an attempt to analyse the qualitative changes in the composition and position of the social, class and political forces since the acquisition of national independence and to investigate the conditions and possibilities for these countries' development along the path of social progress. The author's main aim is to draw attention to the new features and events that make it easier to understand the basic laws and distinguishing traits of the present-day African revolution.

To understand the key problems of the national liberation movement in general and the African revolution in particular it is important to know the Leninist principles concerning the national liberation movement of the oppressed nations. Lenin made a thorough analysis of this movement, defining its role in history as a revolutionary force that was a component part of the world revolutionary process, and charted the path of social progress for socially underdeveloped nations. He brilliantly predicted that the process of decolonisation touched off by the First World War would spread irresistibly and assume revolutionary forms in many countries. He realised that the struggle for independence would give rise not only to national problems in a narrow sense but to new problems of socio-economic development that could not be solved by classical capitalist methods.

Lenin's ideas matured in the course of his irreconcilable struggle against both Right opportunism, which completely ignored the national liberation movement and regarded the colonial world as capitalism's reliable support, and Leftism whose proponents, he said, "occupied an inordinately 'Left' and incorrectly Left position, and far too often, instead of soberly weighing up the situation that was not very favourable for immediate and direct

revolutionary action, they vigorously indulged in the waving of little red flags."[1] Lenin's profound analysis of the socio-economic position of the colonial and dependent countries and the alignment of the social, class and political forces convincingly proved that at its initial stage of development the national liberation movement could not but be bourgeois-democratic if only because the bulk of the population in the backward countries was made up of peasants, and the peasants were representatives of bourgeois-capitalist relations. Therefore, Lenin said, there could be no question of a purely proletarian movement in these countries and, consequently, the revolutionary forces had to support the anti-imperialist liberation struggle of the oppressed nations despite the fact that it was led by bourgeois elements.

Lenin firmly opposed the mechanical application of the forms, ways and means of struggle worked out in countries with a developed social and class structure on the national soil of colonial and dependent countries. He urged revolutionaries to take full account of the national and social conditions in the backward countries, to "seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle a *single* international task: victory over opportunism and Left doctrinairism within the working-class movement."[2]

Very important in this connection was the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which was held in the spring of 1971 and which amplified on the peculiarities of the present stage of development of the national liberation movement. "The main thing," said the Central Committee report delivered by General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, "is that *the struggle for national liberation in many countries has in practical terms begun to grow into a struggle against exploitive relations, both feudal and capitalist.*"[3]

The true Marxists of our day, amplifying upon Lenin's

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, Progress Publishers, Moscow, p. 208.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.

[3] *Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Novosti Press Agency, Moscow, 1971, p. 30.

theory relating to the national and colonial issues and summing up the first practical steps of the independent development of the newly-free states, have advanced quite a few useful ideas characterising the present stage of the national liberation movement and the complex political, socio-economic and ideological problems confronting it.

Interest in the African problems has grown tangibly in the last few years, as testified by numerous treatises on a wide range of problems arising from the African revolution published in different countries. Many works on this subject are being published in the Soviet Union. These works, widely used by the author of this book, deal with the colonial conquests of the imperialist powers and their struggle for the division of the colonies, the nature of the colonialist and neo-colonialist policies pursued by the imperialist states in Africa, the history of the African peoples' national liberation movement, and their struggle for national independence and social progress.[1]

Citing a wealth of facts, Soviet historians have shown that the colonialists nowhere succeeded in suppressing the peoples' urge for freedom and national independence although they resorted to the most subtle methods and forms of violence. The oppressed nations stubbornly resisted the colonialists. The fight put up by the African peoples to win and consolidate their independence is well analysed in the monographs of A. B. Davidson, R. G. Landa and other authors.[2]

Much attention in the works of Soviet Africanists is devoted to questions dealing with the nature and the motive forces of the African revolution, its part in the

---

[1] G. Y. Skorov, *French Imperialism in West Africa*, Moscow, 1956; A. Z. Zusmanovich, *Imperialist Division of Africa*, Moscow, 1959; V. A. Martynov, *The Congo Under the Imperialist Yoke*, Moscow, 1959; L. G. Gukasyan-Gandzaketsi, *French Imperialism and Africa*, Moscow, 1962; Y. Y. Etinger, *FRG Expansion in Arab Countries and Africa*, Moscow, 1962; V. V. Bogoslovsky, *US Policy in Africa*, Moscow, 1964; A. M. Khazanov, *Portugal's Policy in Africa and Asia*, Moscow, 1967; *Britain's Policy in Africa*, Moscow, 1967; *Portugal's Policy in Africa and Asia*, Moscow, 1967. (Works published in the USSR are in Russian unless otherwise stated.)

[2] A. B. Davidson, *The Matabele and Mashona in the Struggle Against British Colonisation*, Moscow, 1958; R. G. Landa, *National Liberation Movement in Algeria (1939-62)*, Moscow, 1962.

world revolutionary process, and the factors, conditions and forms of its development into a socialist revolution.[1]

The peculiarities distinguishing the formation of the African proletariat, its place and role in the national liberation movement, the part played by the trade unions in the political life of the African countries and many other questions are dealt with in the *Working Class of Africa* written by a group of authors.[2]

A number of treatises are devoted to the economic problems confronting the newly-free African countries. Besides dealing with the general theoretical problems of their economic development, these works analyse concrete economic questions—establishment of the public sector, industrialisation, struggle for economic independence, etc.

Much space in economic treatises is allotted to agrarian problems and the development of the productive forces in agriculture. This is understandable, for farming in African countries is the main branch of the economy. The distinguishing features of African agriculture are dealt with in a special treatise[3] which gives an over-all picture of the state of farming, agrarian relations and the position of peasants in tropical Africa. The book describes in detail the African system of landownership and land utilisation, shows how the village community disintegrates through social differentiation, characterises the agricultural proletariat, and dwells on certain new trends and changes in the position of the African peasants and the agrarian system after the acquisition of independence.

Much light is thrown on the ideological aspects of the African revolution in the works of Soviet students of Africa—on the forms and methods employed by the imperialist powers in exerting ideological influence on the emergent countries, the emergence and growth of socialist trends, the peculiarities of present-day nationalism, under the banner of which the African peoples are waging their liberation struggle, and so on.

---

[1] *African Countries' Non-Capitalist Path of Development*, Moscow, 1967; *Anti-Imperialist Revolution in Africa*, Moscow, 1967; V. G. Solodovnikov, *Africa Chooses Its Path. Socio-Economic Problems and Prospects*, Moscow, 1970.

[2] *Working Class of Africa*, Moscow, 1966.

[3] *Agrarian Question and Peasantry in Tropical Africa*, Moscow, 1964.

The book *Contemporary Theories of "National-Type" Socialism*[1] analyses the basic aspects of socialist trends growing in the developing countries, particularly in the newly-free African states. The authors deal in detail with the socialist concepts and the practical steps taken in Egypt, Algeria, Guinea and certain other countries in accordance with their proclaimed programmes of reorganising society along the socialist lines.

A profound objective analysis of the policy documents of the ruling revolutionary-democratic parties, of the extensive literature on the subject and of the nature of the progressive socio-economic transformations have enabled the authors to show how scientific socialism influences the shaping of progressive ideology in these countries and how the evolution of the views of the revolutionary-democratic forces may bring them to the path of scientific socialism, on the one hand, and what difficulties must be overcome, on the other.

In recent years, it must also be said, Soviet researchers have been devoting much attention to elucidating the conditions and factors governing the formation of nations in Africa, the establishment of a single national culture, the initial experience of national development in the newly-independent African countries and the difficulties encountered in the process of solving the national question.[2]

Many newly-independent countries are multi-national. This being so, the national question is of exceptional importance. And if one takes into account the incessant internal strife that is frequently caused by tribal and national differences, one can easily see how important this question is from the scientific and political point of view.

Particularly noteworthy in this respect are the three-volume treatise on the history and present-day problems of the national liberation movement in Asia and Africa[3]

---

[1] *Contemporary Theories of "National-Type" Socialism*, Moscow, 1967.

[2] I. I. Potekhin, *Formation of the National Community of the South African Bantus*, Moscow, 1955; *Formation of National Statehood in Independent African Countries*, Moscow, 1963; G. B. Starushenko, *Nation and State in Emergent Countries*, Moscow, 1967.

[3] *Centuries of Unequal Struggle*, Moscow, 1967; *The Awakening of the Oppressed*, Moscow, 1968; *On a New Road*, Moscow, 1968.

and the three volumes about the classes and class struggle in the developing countries.[1]

Among the indubitable merits of the first treatise, compiled by a large team of Orientalists, is its high scientific level, the wide range of events and facts it deals with, the creative approach to the analysis of the complex national liberation movement problems and the effort thoroughly to explain the new features and events. The authors have succeeded in making clear to the reader the specific conditions in which the oppressed peoples waged their struggle and in depicting the complex and contradictory processes of this struggle. The theoretical conceptions and political conclusions testify to the authors' profound knowledge of the facts and achievements of Soviet Orientalism.

Much space is devoted to Lenin's contribution to the elaboration of the fundamental problems of the theory and tactics of the national liberation movement. The authors rightly stress that in the works he wrote after the October Revolution, Lenin expressed in concentrated form his basic theoretical, programmatic and tactical conclusions regarding the oppressed peoples' liberation struggle and adapted them to the entirely new alignment of forces in the international arena following the victory of the Great October Revolution. Lenin was the first to advance the idea of establishing a single anti-imperialist front, regarding the national liberation movement as part of the world revolutionary process.

The authors of the above-mentioned monographs can claim merit for drawing a number of important theoretical conclusions characterising this movement in general besides elaborating concrete problems relating to separate countries and areas. They analyse the new developments in the national liberation movement not as isolated phenomena but in their relation to the processes taking place in the world today, to the competition of the two world systems, to the new alignment of forces in the international arena and, particularly, to the growing influence the

---

[1] *Classes and Class Struggle in the Developing Countries*, Vol. 1, *Class Structure*, Moscow, 1967; Vol. 2, *Problem of Economic Independence*, Moscow, 1967; Vol. 3, *The Choice of the Road*, Moscow, 1968.

countries of the socialist community exert on world development.

The three-volume *Classes and Class Struggle in the Developing Countries* analyses the structure of the working class, the peasantry, the national bourgeoisie and the middle strata and how they were formed. The analysis of the social-class forces goes side by side with the objective description of the political position of the various classes and strata within one or another class, of their attitude to the key issues of the national liberation movement. The changes in the position of the various classes at the different stages of the national liberation movement are duly dealt with by the authors.

Much attention is devoted to the acute economic problems confronting the newly-independent countries. Particular stress is laid on the problem of economic independence which, in the opinion of the authors, is first and foremost a problem of quickly and substantially raising national labour productivity. The authors criticise the diverse theories advanced by the bourgeois economists in an attempt to justify the gap between the developing and the industrially developed countries.

Characterising the different forms of class struggle, the authors define the conditions for the development of the national liberation revolutions into socialist revolutions, give a theoretical outline of the internal and external factors of non-capitalist development, analyse socio-economic transformations in the progressive newly-free countries, etc.

A brief survey of literature on the subject dealt with in this book shows that the rapid spread of the national liberation movement in Africa in the last few years has stimulated the appearance of quite a few treatises which offer a scientific generalisation of the events and phenomena in Africa combined with the theoretical generalisation of the complex problems of the African revolution.

At the same time, the study of the present stage of the national liberation movement in Africa constantly gives rise to new problems which can be theoretically explained only if the specific traits of the given country or group of countries of more or less the same type are taken into account. Such an attempt to shed light on some

problems of the African revolution is made in this book. The author, however, does not claim to have given a thorough analysis of all the questions he raises, for they require further investigation.

His main task is to draw the reader's attention to the complexity of the political, economic and ideological problems facing Africa today and thus help him better to understand the essence and aims of the African revolution.

THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION—A PART OF THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

The African revolution is an important element of the national liberation movement, part of the world revolutionary process. It is unfolding throughout the vast continent, drawing hundreds of millions of people into the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism, for national and social emancipation. The old colonial empires are crashing under its blows and new independent, sovereign states are rising from their ruins.

The emergence of these African states has wrought substantial changes in the alignment of forces in the international arena and considerably weakened imperialism's political position. The formation of new national states and their transformation into an active anti-imperialist force are an important result of the long and bitter struggle waged by the African peoples for their liberation, an event of major historical significance.

Africa is still one of the crucial sectors of the anti-imperialist front. The contraction of imperialism's sphere of political influence in some parts of the continent is often attended by the intensification of its pressure in others. Forced to retreat, imperialism clings stubbornly to the old moribund regimes and tries to use them in the struggle against the forces of national and social liberation. Its main aim is to preserve and strengthen the last outposts of colonialism and racialism in the southern part of the continent. The colonial-racialist South African bloc, set up to suppress the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia and the other remaining colonies, is in fact spearheaded against all the African countries and holds their state sovereignty in constant peril.

The struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism is, therefore, the basic feature of political life in the Africa of today, the main trend in the development of

the African revolution. This struggle for the abolition of the last colonial and racialist regimes is of major international significance, the basis of the militant unity of the African liberation movement with all revolutionary and democratic forces.

The imperialist powers' intrigues on the African continent are one of the main links in the chain of events and facts testifying to the intensification of their aggressive policy. There is a good reason why Africa is the object of the plots and schemes incessantly hatched by the external and internal reactionary forces. The imperialists simply cannot reconcile themselves to their political defeat there. They had hoped to remain long in Africa. At the end of the 1950s, when the African revolution was gaining momentum and the collapse of the colonial regimes became inevitable, Prof. Chester Bowles disclosed the intentions of the US imperialist circles when he wrote: "By 1970 our present consumption will have doubled, our own resources will have further diminished, and we will be competing with other nations now in the process of rapid industrial growth. If we should be denied access to the raw materials of Asia, we would be seriously handicapped, but we could still maintain our economic growth. But if we were also cut off from the apparently limitless mineral reservoir of Africa, we would face formidable difficulties within a decade even though the resources of Canada and of South America remained available to us."[1]

The imperialists, however, have failed to isolate the African continent from the world liberation movement. The African peoples have dealt colonialism and imperialism a telling blow. The continent accounts for the largest number of countries to have chosen the path of social progress. Socialist ideas have become widespread there. Many newly-free African states have officially proclaimed socialism the aim of their policy and some (the Arab Republic of Egypt, Algeria, Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo, Tanzania, Libya and Somalia) are carrying out progressive socio-economic measures which are paving the way for their future advance to socialism.

The imperialist powers know very well that if nothing

---

[1] Chester Bowles, *Africa's Challenge to America*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1957, p. 53.

is done to check the developments in this part of the world, their influence will be reduced to nill within no time at all. Hence their efforts to hamper the spread of the African revolution. Their main blow is aimed at the progressive regimes. This was graphically evidenced by the outright aggression against Guinea in the autumn of 1970.

The American imperialists have assumed the leading role in the attempts to halt the national liberation movement in Africa and provoke political instability in the newly-free countries there. US imperialism is the main enemy of all that is new and progressive in Africa, an ardent champion of all that is reactionary and conservative.

Taking advantage of the difficulties, especially the economic ones, which inevitably arise when a country sets out to build a new life, the imperialist powers are seeking to launch a counter-offensive to regain their lost positions. In so doing, they hope to split the African countries, shake the African peoples' faith in the possibility of independent development, divide the continent into new spheres of influence on the basis of the present balance of power among the imperialist countries, and prevent the emergent African states from taking the path of social progress.

Relying on the social base of imperialism and neo-colonialism built up of the feudal conservative and bourgeois reactionary forces back in the colonial days and extending this base in every possible way, the international monopolies—particularly American—are trying to tie the newly-free African countries to the world capitalist economy and to perpetuate their unequal position in the system of the capitalist division of labour.

It is these aims that the various neo-colonialist conceptions are designed to promote. Present-day bourgeois ideologists are not averse to reducing the problem of the struggle against colonialism to that of the imminent self-determination of the remaining colonies. Quite a few books and articles have been published in the West portraying Western colonialists as bearers of civilisation and neo-colonialism as a system developing the interdependence of the former colonial powers and the emergent nations.

For example, British sociologist Brian Crozier appeals to the developing countries "to break away from the colonial past of bitterness and suspicion and to create a new and healthier relationship" with the "former imperial powers" and urges the replacement of the term "neo-colonialism" by "interdependence".[1]

But this is more than just an argument over terminology. It is an attempt to embellish the colonial policy of the imperialist powers, to lull the African peoples' vigilance in the face of the growing danger of neo-colonialism. Colonialism actually means exploitation and oppression of one nation by the ruling class of another. Acquisition of political independence by the African peoples has not put an end to their economic exploitation. All it has brought in its wake is a change in the forms, means and methods of exploitation.

Not only every antagonistic formation but every stage of capitalist development has its own specific forms of colonial exploitation. The era of primitive accumulation was distinguished by the open armed robbery of the countries on other continents by European countries. The distinctive feature of the era of capitalism's rise was the plunder of the enslaved nations through the introduction of forced labour. Industrial capitalism exploited the economically backward countries primarily by turning them into commodity markets. Lastly, with the appearance of imperialism, the colonies became first and foremost sources of raw materials and spheres of capital investment. Lenin wrote that "to the numerous 'old' motives of colonial policy, finance capital has added the struggle for the sources of raw materials, for the export of capital, for spheres of influence, i.e., for spheres for profitable deals, concessions, monopoly profits and so on, economic territory in general".[2]

The changes of the basic historical forms of colonial exploitation reflected not only the advent of new stages in the development of capitalism in the metropolitan countries but the economic and social level of the colonial and dependent countries themselves.

Some bourgeois ideologists seek to prove that colonial-

---

[1] B. Crozier, *Neo-Colonialism*, London, 1964, p. 112.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 299.

ism is no longer dangerous since there are practically no colonies left in the world. The realities belie this thesis. The struggle even against the so-called classical colonialism is still going on. There are colonies remaining on African soil to this day and their peoples are fighting valiantly for independence. Moreover, the fact that the old colonial empires are fast disintegrating does not at all mean that the imperialists will not try to establish foothold to spread their influence in the African countries. Although modern colonialism is retreating under the blows of the national liberation movement, the danger it presents to the formerly oppressed nations has not lessened. It is still there.

The developments in Africa show that the imperialists have not given up the idea of exporting counter-revolution with the aid of brute force. In their attempts to quash the national liberation movement in Africa, the imperialists have time and again resorted to armed force, using the military bases they maintain in other countries and aggressive military blocs and alliances for this purpose. They have set themselves the task of checking the development of the African revolution, preventing progressive socio-economic and political reforms in the newly-independent African countries and establishing a neo-colonial order there. That is why aggression, plots and provocations against any one African country should not be regarded as isolated episodes. They are directed against the whole of Africa, against the progress of the entire African national liberation movement.

Bourgeois propaganda has latterly been insisting that the existence of the colonies and the political and especially economic difficulties experienced by the newly-free African countries are due to the insufficient aid given them by the Great Powers. What is more, an attempt is being made to equate the Soviet Union with the imperialist states and make out that it too is to blame for the low level of these countries' social and economic development. Both in the capitalist West and in some of the developing countries the same yardstick is applied to the socialist and imperialist states whenever the economic backwardness of the former colonies and semi-colonies is discussed: all industrially developed countries, it is asserted, should participate equally in the elimination of

the damage caused the developing countries by long years of merciless imperialist exploitation.

Hence the attempt to lump together all the so-called rich countries (both imperialist and socialist), to place them on the same footing and to present them with the same demands for increased aid to the developing countries on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

The gap between the levels of economic development of the developing and industrially developed capitalist countries is rooted in the capitalist economic system.

The socialist countries are in no way to blame for the economic plight of the developing African countries—a plight engendered by colonial rule and neo-colonialist policies—and have nothing to do with the rise and the existence of the problem of their economic backwardness.

The imperialist powers' policy towards the African countries is directed solely at forcing them to take the capitalist path of development and abstain from any action tending to restrict and abolish private enterprise.

Particular stress in the neo-colonialist policy of the imperialist powers is laid on the export of finance capital. Neo-colonialism is sometimes called "financial colonialism" whose tentacles, like those of an octopus, hold in their grip the key economic branches of many newly-free African countries.

Capital is exported both in the form of direct investments (private and state) into industry, transport, trade, construction, etc., and in the form of loans and credits. The United States, already the biggest exporter of capital before the Second World War, has further increased its investments in other countries, including Africa, since the end of the war.

The flow of foreign investments is strongly influenced by the loss by the imperialist powers of the monopoly on the delivery of machinery and equipment to the developing countries. The latter can now acquire machinery and equipment from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and build their own industry with their assistance. The imperialists are forced to reckon with the urge of the emergent African countries to develop their productive forces and build not only light but heavy industry, as well as to take into account their economic development plans. The result is that, despite the pre-

dominance of the classical colonial spheres of capital investment, there is a new tendency in the exports of the imperialist monopolies that is making itself felt ever more strongly—the tendency to invest in the manufacturing industry, and not only light but heavy too.

Especially active in this respect, along with the US monopolies, are the West German and Japanese monopolies which seek to profit by the attachment of the monopolies of the "old" colonial powers to the old spheres and forms of investment in the African countries. Taking full advantage of the fact that their economies have grown faster since the end of the war than the economies of other developed capitalist countries, West Germany and Japan are trying to persuade the newly-free countries that they can solve their problems only by taking the capitalist path. But behind all their tempting suggestions one sees the same neo-colonialist essence of the policy followed by the imperialist powers in Africa.

In the decades during which imperialism ruled supreme in the African countries their dependence on international finance capital assumed different forms. In a number of countries, foreign capital established either direct full or partial control over production in the form of concessions (oil concessions, plantations, etc.) and industrial enterprises, or indirect control by dominating the credit and financial system and foreign trade. The imperialists carefully conceal the true extent to which they plunder the former colonies. But there have been estimates showing that the imperialist monopolies had pumped more than $30,000 million in profit from the developing countries in 1965-69.

There is a strong urge to invite foreign investments in the developing African countries suffering from shortage of capital. Are the countries rejecting the services of monopoly capital doing right? There is no one-syllable answer to this question. All the more so since there is no single approach to this question in these countries themselves. Some of them encourage foreign investments but do not allow their national interests to be infringed upon and take good care to make the maximum use of the internal sources of accumulation. For others, foreign capital is practically the only means of solving internal economic problems.

Sometimes the emergent African states advance certain conditions for the participation of foreign capital in the establishment of the national economy. Among other things, they see to it that the foreign monopolies put their capital into the building of new branches of industry (chiefly the manufacturing ones), that new enterprises are built with the participation of national private or state capital and specialise in manufacturing the goods that now have to be imported, that the foreign enterprises help train the administrative and technical personnel they need from the local population, and so on.

These and the other measures limiting the activity of foreign capitalists enabled the independent African countries to develop their productive forces. Consequently, it would be inexpedient to bypass this possibility. But, at the same time, it would hardly be right to rely only on foreign capital, without making any effort to mobilise the internal resources of accumulation. There is more to it than the fact that the developing African countries have to pay a big interest for the so-called economic and technical assistance and credits received from the imperialist powers.

The question is, on what terms foreign capital is advanced and what aims it serves. Experience shows that emergent states invariably become strongly dependent economically on the imperialist monopolies if they are not wary enough when enlisting the assistance of foreign capital and weaken their control over the activity of the monopolies. Finance capital, Lenin wrote, is "such a great, such a decisive, you might say, force in all economic and in all international relations, that it is capable of subjecting, and actually does subject, to itself even states enjoying the fullest political independence".[1]

The imperialists do not rely only on military and economic methods in their attempts to prevent the development of the African revolution. They also intensify their political and ideological pressure upon the population of the African countries.

In a number of these countries imperialism is making certain sections of the population, especially the bourgeois bureaucracy, serve its neo-colonialist purposes. As

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 259.

far as these sections are concerned, the revolution ends with their advent to power. The bulk of the urban and rural working people, petty bourgeoisie, intellectuals and patriotic officers, on the other hand, are by far not always satisfied with the results achieved. The neo-colonialists stint neither effort nor funds to undermine and split the national liberation forces in Africa. They employ the most subtle methods to this end, fomenting national and religious strife, whipping up nationalistic and chauvinistic feelings, provoking border incidents, etc. They make use of the pro-imperialist sections and groups of the population to create differences within the national liberation movement and its organisations.

That is why the elaboration of effective measures against all forms of neo-colonialism is in the focus of attention of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist forces of Africa. They know that formal sovereignty alone is not enough to ensure complete emancipation. To achieve it, it is necessary to destroy all the levers of imperialist oppression and exploitation, carry out far-reaching socio-economic reforms, create the material and political prerequisites for national regeneration and social progress. The struggle against neo-colonialism is at the same time a struggle for the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces taking part in the African revolution.

The successful consummation of the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution in the African countries created conditions for the implementation of pressing socio-economic reforms. The logic of revolutionary expediency is convincing many statesmen and public and political figures of the advantages of the new forms and methods of economic management. The rise and consolidation of socialist-oriented progressive regimes are strengthening the position of socialism in Africa. Socialism is very popular there, first, thanks to the huge successes of the socialist states, which have proved in practice its superiority to all other systems, and, secondly, because the Africans rightly identify capitalism with colonialism which had brought them so much hardship and suffering.

The struggle for social progress in the newly-free African countries goes on in different conditions. Its course depends on many factors: level of social development, nature of political power, depth of social-class

stratification, etc. The distinctive national and social traits and tasks of the revolution carried out in some of the African countries require a large variety of ways, forms and methods of consummating it. The peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Namibia (South-West Africa) and South Africa are still waging a heroic struggle, in most of these countries with arms in hand, to free themselves from colonial bondage. The countries which have won political independence are concentrating attention on their economic liberation, elimination of their economic backwardness and democratisation of public institutions. Of paramount importance at the same time is the political struggle against the attempts made by the imperialists and the local reactionary forces to provoke political instability in these countries, revive the colonial order and regain in one form or another the positions they had lost.

In many African countries the national liberation movement has entered a new stage. What distinguishes this new stage, what are its specific traits? The answer to this question is to be sought first and foremost in the qualitative changes in the composition and attitude of the social-class and political forces taking part in the national liberation movement, in the new possibilities for taking the path of social progress opening up before the emergent African states.

Creatively developing Lenin's theory on the national and colonial questions and generalising the revolutionary developments of our day in analysing the problems of the African revolution and working out its strategy and tactics, Marxists draw particular attention to the new features and events which make it possible better to understand the fundamental laws governing the growth of the national liberation movement and its distinguishing traits.

The present stage of the African national liberation movement is making substantial changes in the position occupied in the world by the developing countries of Africa, in the alignment of social-class and political forces in the emergent countries and in the relations among these forces.

As the day when the newly-free African countries won political independence recedes, the differences among

them grow bigger and social-class differentiation inside these countries increases. The increasingly evident differences are due not only to the level of the newly-free African countries' economic and social development but to political factors too.

When the African countries were colonies and semi-colonies, their division into various groups was naturally predetermined by the level of capitalism's development. The political factors did not play the role they do now, after these countries became independent.

In the brief historical period since the acquisition of political independence, none of the newly-free countries have advanced economically sufficiently far to make it possible to affirm that a serious gap has developed between their economic development levels in these years. The differences in their socio-economic development are more or less the ones they inherited from the colonial days. To understand the new differences among the African countries it is obviously necessary to proceed less from the economic factors than from the political ones, which may play a decisive role at a certain stage.

Among these factors the first and foremost are the character of state power, political organisation of the masses and development of democracy. It is on these factors that the solution of many important problems of the African revolution, among them such a pressing one as the social and economic progress of the newly-independent countries, depends. Without a stable political system there can be no rapid economic development in the backward countries.

The crises experienced in the last few years by some sections of the African national liberation movement were due precisely to the fact that many questions, on which a country's internal political stability depends, remained unresolved. This is one of the most pressing problems which in one way or another actually affects all the newly-independent African countries, all the classes and social groups, all the political parties. These questions are heatedly discussed within and without the developing African countries, producing different and sometimes absolutely contradictory views.

In this respect, the newly-independent African countries can be divided into two groups—the socialist-oriented

states taking the non-capitalist path of development, and the capitalist-oriented states seeking to adapt the forms and methods of capitalist development and bourgeois democracy to their national conditions. Such a division reflects the general political situation which has taken shape in these countries, the nature of state power and the alignment of the social-class forces, although all these factors are subject to constant and often unexpected changes. It would be wrong to assume that the problem of political power, internal political stability and the forms and methods of democratically uniting the progressive forces concern only the countries which have taken the capitalist path of development. These problems are no less pressing in the progressive countries choosing the non-capitalist and socialist paths.

A number of newly-free countries are ruled by revolutionary democratic parties. But the fact that they are in power does not solve by itself the question of politically organising the working masses and thus securing internal political stability. Not infrequently the revolutionary democratic parties display weakness in tackling such cardinal problems as getting the working masses to take a really active part in public affairs, in the solution of the complex and vital tasks of national and social liberation.

While the progressive African states have made a definite theoretical and practical contribution to the solution of the problem of the backward countries' social development, they still have an important problem facing them in the sphere of political democracy—the problem of elaborating the kind of political structure that would accord with their national, historical and social conditions and ensure the fullest possible participation of all the progressive and patriotic forces in the administration of the country. This specific form of political democracy is designed to reflect the unique distinctive features of African countries and, above all, to prove that none of the present-day social classes and political parties is in a position to direct single-handedly the process of the newly-independent African states' transition from the old colonial society to the developed society. That applies equally to the national bourgeoisie which is weakly developed and to the proletariat which, being young, inadequately organised and insufficiently class-conscious, is

as yet incapable of playing the role of hegemonic force in the national liberation revolution.

One of the paramount tasks of the African revolution in these circumstances is the establishment of a broad, flexible and solid political popular front that would take into account the specific conditions in Africa and create the most favourable atmosphere for the participation of the masses in building a new society. The development of the national liberation revolution on this continent and its gradual growth into a socialist revolution will depend a great deal on the solution of these problems.

The establishment of a single national democratic front is not a tactical task of a temporary nature. It is a long-term historical problem. The advocates of colonialism and neo-colonialism allege that the revolutionary forces' proposals for the close co-operation of all democratic and patriotic forces within the framework of a single front are merely a manoeuvre meant to camouflage their drive for political power. And they try to convince the non-proletarian strata that there will be no place for them in the new political structure of society. At the same time they affirm that the establishment of a single national democratic front is out of the question inasmuch as—and here they quote Marxists—class struggle in the newly-free countries will assume increasingly acute forms as they advance along the path of social progress.

Having set themselves the task of driving a wedge between the sections of the African national liberation movement, some bourgeois authors seek even to prove that the unity of the national democratic forces is possible only during the struggle for political independence, when the national task they are solving is relatively easy and clear to all the segments of the population. In the next phase of the struggle for social and economic liberation, that is, when the far more complex problems of the African revolution have to be solved, the alliance of the democratic and progressive forces is impossible, they say.

There is no denying, of course, that it is difficult to unite the progressive and democratic forces participating in the national liberation movement. But this is no reason for excluding the possibility and necessity of uniting these forces in a single national front. Sharp social conflicts do not arise by themselves. They are the result

of the actions of definite classes and their political parties. Marxists have never denied the possibility of the non-proletarian strata, including bourgeois elements, participating in the revolutionary struggle not only in the phase of general democratic movement, such as the present-day African revolution is by nature, but in the period of socialist construction too. There is an objective reason for all the anti-imperialist forces to be united within the framework of a single national democratic front.

Such unity naturally cannot but take into account the changes in the position of the different classes and social forces, their role and place in the national liberation movement, and their relations with one another. An analysis of the character and the motive forces of the African revolution shows that its leaders are, as a rule, representatives of the non-proletarian strata. One of the most important tasks of the revolutionary forces is to establish correct relations with these strata, and actively to co-operate with them. What especially distinguishes the revolutionary movement in Africa is that the national liberation revolution may begin growing into a socialist revolution long before the working class has assumed the leadership of the socialist movement. The role and importance of the working class will grow along with the African countries' advance towards socialism. But they can achieve socialism only through a socialist revolution. The ways of accomplishing the socialist revolution and the forms of development of the national democratic revolution into a socialist one are not the same everywhere. Lenin stressed this on many occasions. "All nations," he wrote, "will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."[1]

As for the progressive newly-independent African countries which have taken the path of non-capitalist development, their transition to socialism—in the absence of outside intervention—may assume peaceful forms and

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

come about through the evolution of the ideological and political views of the non-proletarian forces now heading the revolutionary movement, through their adoption of scientific socialism. At the same time one cannot fully exclude the possibility that the development of the national revolution may assume sharper forms in some African countries, including the form of armed struggle.

An important role at the present stage of development of the African revolution is played by democratisation, for, as Lenin wrote, "whoever wants to reach socialism by any other path than that of political democracy, will inevitably arrive at conclusions that are absurd and reactionary both in the economic and the political sense".[1]

There are many factors influencing public affairs in the newly-free African countries, among them the absence of strong democratic traditions and the insufficiently high cultural and political level of the masses. Nevertheless, these objective factors give no grounds to affirm that their social and economic progress may be ensured by governmental decrees, without the masses' participation and interest in the building of a new society. The facts show that the deliberate obstruction of the process of democratisation of social life can only hamper the solution of the general democratic tasks of the national liberation movement.

It is because of inadequate democratisation that the reactionary forces in some countries still succeed with their counter-revolutionary plots against the forces of national and social liberation. Without the participation of the working masses in revolutionary activity, without the encouragement of their initiative it is simply impossible to consummate the socio-economic transformations undertaken in a number of progressive developing African countries and create conditions for their subsequent transition to socialism.

Much attention is being paid in the progressive African countries to the problem of party development, to the elaboration of the forms of the political organisation of the masses most suitable to the social and national conditions in these countries. Many are beginning to realise that to secure the victory of the revolution and build a

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 29.

new society it is necessary to have a party which would be expressive of the ideology of the working class and know the objective laws of social development. Among other things, attempts are being made to reorganise the existing mass parties with a view to uniting the most progressive forces devoted to the revolutionary cause within their ranks.

Different African countries evolve different ways of politically organising the masses. Some have a one-party system of government, others are ruled by a coalition of progressive political parties united in a single national democratic front. Irrespective of the form political organisation of the masses may assume in this or that country, the thing is to ensure the possibility of using the positive contribution of all the patriotic, progressive and revolutionary forces, whatever class, party and trend they may belong to.

In these circumstances, the unity of the anti-imperialist forces on both the national and international scale is exceptionally important for the success of the African revolution. The objective conditions prevailing in the African countries make it imperative to unite all the anti-imperialist forces, for without that it is impossible to withstand the pressure of imperialism and successfully build a new life. Post-war imperialist strategy is a combination of forced withdrawal from certain positions and intensification of aggression in other directions. And so, though it is more or less of a local nature on each occasion, imperialism's aggressiveness on the whole remains global in scope. Any African country may become the object of aggression if imperialism sees that its single national democratic front is growing weaker. It will immediately try to take advantage of this situation to alter the balance of the internal forces in its favour and check the national liberation movement.

The unity of the patriotic forces and political parties was one of the main reasons for the relatively fast victory of the national liberation revolutions. This unity is still the main weapon of the formerly oppressed nations, for the struggle against colonialism and imperialism is not yet over.

In addition to the common aims of the anti-imperialist struggle at the present stage, there are historical reasons

for the unity of the forces taking part in the African revolution and their close ties with the present-day revolutionary movements and especially the world socialist system. It is a well-known fact that the decisive factor of the successful development of the colonial peoples' national liberation movements in general and the African revolution in particular was the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution which dealt a shattering blow to imperialism's colonial system. It roused hundreds of millions of people to active political life and drew them into the world revolutionary movement.

The situation changed radically after the victory of the October Revolution. It was the turning point in the development of the national liberation movement too. The October Revolution vastly stimulated the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies, made it more organised, opened up wide vistas before it and imbued huge masses of people with confidence that their liberation was not far off.

The October Revolution exerted a truly all-round influence on the African peoples' liberation struggle. But what evoked their interest most was the example it set in solving the national and agrarian problems, that is, the problems the solution of which is the main aim of the African revolution at the present stage of its development.

The October Revolution also influenced the national liberation movement ideologically and considerably accelerated the formation of progressive views among its participants, notably among the working people.

The extension of socialism beyond the bounds of one country and the formation of the world socialist system radically altered the alignment of the world forces and created new and more favourable conditions for the development of the national liberation struggle in Africa.

One of the most important characteristics of the democratic, anti-imperialist protest today is that it is drawing new social groups and strata into its orbit. This objective development, though not always clear-cut, is a consequence of the inner logic of evolution of imperialism itself, for state-monopoly capitalism cannot exist without imposing its control over all the structures and aspects of society and that, naturally, is resisted by the democratic

and progressive forces and, consequently, broadens the front of the anti-imperialist struggle.

The developments of the last few decades show that although imperialism, as a world system, has not become any stronger, it is still a serious and dangerous enemy possessing a powerful arsenal of economic, political and ideological instruments of pressure upon the newly-free countries and it has mastered different methods of splitting the revolutionary and democratic movement.

The imperialist powers have latterly sharply intensified their aggressive policy. Their strategy aims at weakening and undermining the position of the socialist camp and suppressing the world democratic and national liberation movement.

It is becoming increasingly clear that imperialism is set on crushing democracy, on launching an offensive on all fronts and in all directions. The imperialists resort on a large scale to violence, repression and anti-labour legislation. At the same time, they do not forget such well-tested and well-camouflaged forms of struggle against the liberation movement as social demagoguery, bourgeois reformism, and Right-opportunist ideology and policy, using them to take the sting out of the class struggle in the developed capitalist countries and the anti-imperialist movement in the developing countries.

Imperialism has always been the main source of international tension. It has plunged mankind into the abyss of two world wars. Today it has unleashed an arms race on an unprecedented scale. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the world output of civilian goods and services in the last fifty years has increased five-fold, while military spending has gone up ten-fold.

There are about 10 million people, or more than 14 per cent of the total labour force, directly involved in the arms drive in the United States. Directly subordinated to the Pentagon are 3.5 million servicemen, 1.5 million civilians and one million reservists who receive pay from the Defence Department. The US war industry employs 3.8 million people. Twenty per cent of all American engineers are engaged in war production. More than 22,000 contractors and about 100,000 sub-contractors make fabulous profits on arms orders.

At the Congress economic sub-committee hearings in the autumn of 1968 it was revealed that the major Pentagon contractors' profits were 70 per cent above those of the manufacturers of civilian goods.

Although the most rabidly aggressive elements of present-day imperialism can still cause no little calamity and suffering to the peoples of the world, they are incapable of regaining the historical initiative they have lost or reversing world development. The main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, the revolutionary forces. Ours is the time of the powerful world-wide upsurge of the anti-imperialist struggle.

In the forefront of this struggle are the countries of the world socialist community. "The contribution of the world socialist system to the common cause of the anti-imperialist forces is determined primarily by its growing economic potential," the Communist and Workers' Parties stressed at their meeting in Moscow in 1969. "The swift economic development of the countries belonging to the socialist system at rates outpacing the economic growth of the capitalist countries, the advance of socialism to leading positions in a number of fields of scientific and technological progress, and the blazing of a trail into outer space by the Soviet Union—all these tangible results, produced by the creative endeavours of the peoples of the socialist countries, decisively contribute to the preponderance of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism over imperialism."[1]

The world socialist system, merging with the international working-class and national liberation movements into a single mighty revolutionary torrent, determines the main direction of historical development. Adapting the Leninist thesis on the main contradiction of the present epoch—the contradiction between the two social systems, socialism and capitalism—to the present conditions, the Marxist parties proceed from the premise that the struggle against imperialism and for the world-wide victory of socialism waged by the international working class and the socialist states is the main element of world social

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, Prague, 1969, p. 22.

development. The growth of the economic, political and military potential of the socialist states creates the basis which ensures the transformation of the world socialist system into the decisive factor of mankind's development. Each new victory scored by socialism in its economic competition with capitalism means a further change in the international balance of forces in favour of progress and creates increasingly favourable conditions for the development of the world revolutionary process.

The study of the extensive data on class struggle, including the unprecedented strike movement, allows to speak of the further expansion of the anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist movement, of a qualitatively new phase in the struggle between labour and capital. The polarisation of the class forces in the developed capitalist society is proceeding apace, the social contradictions are growing sharper. The scientific and technological revolution in the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism accelerates the polarisation of the class forces and gives rise to new social contradictions and conflicts that are much more profound and acute than they used to be. The deep-going differentiation within the bourgeois class itself and the rise of new contradictions between the handful of financial magnates, on the one hand, and the vast majority of the population and the fast-growing army of hired labour, on the other, multiply the possibilities for winning new allies for the working class.

The entry of the broad non-proletarian masses into the struggle against the state-monopoly system of imperialism is by no means a spontaneous process. The force that has set these strata into motion, inspired them by its example and put them on the road of action is the working class. Before the anti-monopoly struggle assumed its present scope, the proletariat had in the last decade waged heavy and bitter class battles. A huge role in the mobilisation and release of the energy of the non-proletarian anti-monopoly forces was played by the development of the international revolutionary and democratic movement—by the achievements of the socialist countries, the growth of the national liberation movement and the expansion of the common front of anti-imperialist struggle.

The international working class now acts together with its numerous new allies and its struggle for the ultimate

aims intertwines with the struggle of diverse democratic forces as well as with the African peoples' national liberation struggle. As the state-monopoly trends in the development of imperialism grow stronger, the struggle waged by the working class and its allies for immediate and ultimate aims assumes an increasingly clear anti-imperialist character.

The demands for radical reforms and the democratic transformation of the basic socio-economic structures are raised not only by the proletariat's political parties but by its mass organisations. The masses are coming to realise more and more the fact that without such transformations, which limit and undermine the power of the monopolies and alter the correlation of class forces in favour of the workers, the material and social gains achieved in bitter class struggle are ephemeral.

The workers' gains in the developed capitalist countries have become possible because the social achievements of the working class in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries force monopoly capital to alternate repressive measures with social manoeuvres on a large scale, to make certain concessions to the working class. That is why the recognition in principle of some of the fundamental rights of the workers of the capitalist countries is now in fact irreversible.

At the same time, the social concessions and privileges won by the workers as a result of bitter class struggle are highly unstable and limited under capitalism. They can be curtailed as a result of recessions, political actions of the imperialist governments and the resistance and sabotage of the monopolies. Consequently, the working class is compelled continuously to wage and intensify its struggle in defence of its rights, for better working and living conditions.

The capitalist monopolies seek to curtail or completely nullify the workers' gains whenever an opportunity offers itself and especially when recession sets in. The monopoly bourgeoisie widely publicises its concessions, seeking to blunt the workers' class consciousness and dampen their social activity by demagogic propaganda. It is this aim that such celebrated concepts as "people's capitalism", "social partnership" and "welfare state" are meant to serve. Using the technically efficient "propaganda in-

dustry", the monopolists seek to divert the working masses from politics and switch their attention to personal wants and individualistic ideals.

In other words, so long as the levers of economic and political power remain in the hands of the monopolies, poverty and the inferior position of millions of working people will be inevitable and the gains wrested by the working class and its allies in bitter and stubborn struggle limited and insecure.

In these circumstances, the working people can improve their economic and social position only by fighting against the omnipotence of the monopolies. In the ten years ending 1969, the number of people involved in the strike movement in the capitalist world increased from 36 million to 60 million. In the industrially developed countries, the figure for the same period rose from 16 million to 44 million. And in the six leading capitalist countries—the United States, Britain, France, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan—the total number of strikers went up from 2.7 million in 1965 to 30.9 million in 1969.

In their anti-monopoly strike struggle the working class and its allies demand radical democratic reforms in the economic as well as social and political spheres. In the struggle for these reforms, which aim at restricting arbitrary monopoly rule, the broad working-class masses and the social groups which are now taking an increasingly active part in the public movement acquire political experience, learn to discern their main enemy—the monopolistic oligarchy, become better organised and enhance their militancy. In this struggle, the working class wins authority and the confidence of its allies and builds up a broad anti-monopoly coalition around itself.

The experience gained by the international working-class movement and the lessons of the class battles of the past decade vividly prove that the anti-imperialist struggle of the revolutionary and democratic forces is effective when it is linked with the tasks and interests of the entire world liberation movement and is based on international solidarity.

The fact that the socialist system is the leading force of the world revolutionary process by no means detracts from the importance of the other elements of the world revolution or from the struggle of the oppressed nations.

All the aspects of the single revolutionary process are closely bound with one another, act in concert and merge into a single current which erodes world imperialism. The greater the achievements of the world socialist system and the more intense the struggle of the working class in the developed capitalist countries, the more favourable will be the conditions for the African revolution and the bigger its contribution to the common anti-imperialist struggle.

Marxists-Leninists have always regarded the national liberation movement as a major component of the world revolutionary process, as a powerful force that helps demolish the imperialist front. They have always proceeded from the fact that the earnest of success in the struggle against the forces of imperialism, for national liberation and social progress lies in the unity and interaction of the great revolutionary forces of our day—the world socialist system, the international working-class movement and the national liberation revolutions.

MOTIVE FORCES OF THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

Almost all the classes and social groups in Africa are taking part in its peoples' anti-imperialist national liberation struggle.

The main pillar of the African revolution is the *peasantry*. The very fact that the national liberation movement is taking place in agrarian countries underscores the special role of the African peasantry and its importance as a mass revolutionary force. There are many African countries where it constitutes two-thirds of the population. The peasants' difficult economic position drives them to wage an active struggle against colonial exploitation, for national and social emancipation.

In some countries, the peasants' struggle in the years immediately before the acquisition of political independence assumed the character of agrarian revolutions. Suffice it to recall, for instance, the revolutionary actions of the peasants of Algeria, where this struggle grew into an armed uprising. Today, it is the peasants who are fighting arms in hand for the liberation of South Africa, Angola, Mozambique and other countries still languishing in colonial bondage.

At the initial stage of the liberation movement the peasantry acts as a political homogeneous force united in its struggle by a single aim. The success of the national liberation revolution, its scope and nature depend a great deal on the position of the peasantry, on the level of its organisation and on what social class and political forces it supports.

In Africa, the peasant movement was most intensive in the pre-independence period and in the early years of independent development, when the new sovereign states set out to draw up and implement agrarian reforms. The peasants' struggle was exceptionally sharp. Under its impact some countries passed progressive land laws

whose implementation could have considerably facilitated the solution of the agrarian question.

Later, the peasant movement somewhat declined, the peasants' political activity subsided, and the ruling quarters took advantage of that to slow down the agrarian reforms and to renounce the concessions they had been forced to make under the pressure of the widespread peasant movement.

What are the causes of the decline of the peasant movement in many countries and what is retarding its development now?

1. Not only the conditions in which the peasants wage their struggle but the very nature of the peasant movement and the direction it takes change with the conquest of political independence. The satisfaction of the peasants' demands now depends not only on the former colonial powers but on the policy of the new government which exerts a direct influence on the solution of the agrarian-peasant question.

The nature of state power in the newly-independent African countries makes a definite imprint on the character of agrarian transformations and gives rise to peasant actions that differ in scope, intensity and form.

There is, however, one thing common to a number of African countries: while before the conquest of political independence the national bourgeoisie (and sometimes even the patriotically-minded feudal rulers) encouraged the peasants' struggle and used it to further their class interests, after coming to power and thus achieving the main aim they sought they are generally no longer interested in activising the peasant movement. What is more, they have exerted no little effort to dampen the political ardour of the peasant movement and split it, and to reduce the programme of agrarian reforms they themselves have proclaimed to measures which, if even carried through, would not alter substantially the agrarian system and the nature of state power.

2. Although the agrarian reforms have essentially retained the old forms of landownership almost everywhere, their implementation has accelerated the development of capitalism in agriculture. The differentiation of the peasantry is gaining momentum. It is becoming increasingly evident that the peasantry is splitting into two

strata—the well-to-do peasants on the one hand and the poor peasants who are forced to sell their labour and become hired workers, on the other. Naturally this process is not the same everywhere, but in one form or another it has affected many newly-free African countries. Even tropical Africa, where the communal landownership system had for a long time retarded the development of capitalism in agriculture, has not escaped the process of class differentiation in the countryside.

The peasants who profited most from the reform gradually withdraw from the struggle, become the social mainstay of the essentially new bourgeois power in the countryside and slow down the development of the peasant movement. If we take into account not only the number of the well-to-do peasants (although in some countries it is growing rather fast) but its capacity to exert economic pressure upon the poorest segments of the peasantry, we shall not find it difficult to see what role the ruling classes are assigning to the well-to-do peasants in checking the peasants' struggle.

3. During the struggle for independence the peasants supported the national bourgeoisie who had won them over with their highly-publicised national democratic programme, one of the main provisions of which was the implementation of anti-feudal agrarian reforms. But the peasants' hopes for the improvement of their material well-being, which they associated with the conquest of national independence, waned with the national bourgeoisie's withdrawal from revolutionary positions. Political independence did not tangibly improve the peasants' economic and social position, and in many countries it became even worse.

This led to the peasants' disappointment with the results of the struggle. They clearly began to distrust the new leaders who proved incapable of keeping the promises they had given during the struggle for independence.

At the same time, the revolutionary democratic forces were unable immediately to assume leadership of the peasant movement and draw up the kind of programme of agrarian reforms that would draw the peasants into an active revolutionary struggle and make them devoted allies of the revolutionary democratic forces.

To these factors one should add the continuing division

of the peasant movement, the powerful patriarchal and feudal survivals among the peasants and a number of other barriers that hold back the development of the peasants' struggle.

Nevertheless, there are still objective conditions in the newly-free African countries for the development of the peasant movement on a new basis, for the transformation of the peasantry into an active political force capable of working serious revolutionary changes in the Third World. The significance of the peasant movement, a major explosive force, is enormous. It may safely be said that the development of the African countries and the progress and outcome of the economic and social transformations undertaken in them will to a large extent depend on the peasantry's stand, on what political forces it chooses to support.

Marxists have always greatly valued the peasants' revolutionary role in the national liberation movement. Lenin, it might be recalled, acknowledged the possibility of peasant Soviets in countries with a backward social-class structure, regarding them as one of the forms for the development of national liberation revolutions into socialist revolutions. "The ideas and principles of Soviet government," he wrote, "are understood and immediately applicable, not only in the industrially developed countries, not only in those which have a social basis like the proletariat, but also in those which have the peasantry as their basis."[1]

But Marxists-Leninists never idealised the peasantry and never overestimated its revolutionary potentialities. They clearly realised that because of the objective causes of its historical development and its socio-economic position, it was the most sluggish social class.

Incidentally, one of the fundamental differences between Marxism-Leninism and Trotskyism and other "Left" trends lies in the different approach to the appraisal of the peasantry in general and its role in the national liberation movement in particular. While it is characteristic of Marxists-Leninists objectively to view the revolutionary peasant movement and its weak and strong points, the adherents of petty-bourgeois "revolutionism" either en-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 490.

tirely ignore the peasantry, regarding it as a reactionary force, or claim that it is the vanguard of the world revolution and ascribe "super-revolutionary" traits to it.

Concepts exaggerating the revolutionism of the peasantry in the countries of the East in general and in the African countries in particular are advanced and upheld by spokesmen for the ideologically and politically most diverse trends. The thesis of the peasants' "super-revolutionism", preached by Left extremists, is designed to substantiate their conclusion that the focal point of the world revolution is shifting to the agrarian countries. The idea that the peasants play a special role in the building of national-type socialism is also to be found in the programmes of certain revolutionary democratic parties.

The conception of the peasantry's role as the most revolutionary class was preached by Franz Fanon, an ideologue of the African revolution whose ideas are still current in some African countries. "It is clear," he wrote, "that in the colonial countries the peasants alone are revolutionary, for they have nothing to lose and everything to gain. The starving peasant, outside the class system, is the first among the exploited to discover that only violence pays. For him there is no compromise, no possible coming to terms."[1] Quoting these words of Fanon's, Raymond Barbé, French Marxist student of African problems, rightly points out that "poverty and exploitation by themselves are not enough. It is, moreover, necessary to comprehend the depth of this poverty, the causes of this exploitation."[2]

To regard the peasants as the vanguard of the African revolution, despite the substantial differences sometimes existing between them, is objectively to belittle the role of the working class in the national liberation movement. The followers of the "peasant vanguard" theory regard the classes in the developing African countries as something stationary and do not take into account their interrelations, the evolution of these interrelations, their movement and development.

Agriculture in the African countries is indeed the main

---

[1] Franz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York, 1968, p. 61.

[2] Raymond Barbé, *Les classes sociales en Afrique noire*, Paris, p. 51.

sphere of material production and the peasants are the basic productive force. It is also true that the peasants are ruthlessly exploited, suffer from poverty and lack of political and social rights, and from the prevailing feudal and, at times, pre-feudal relationships. But does that mean that the leading role in the national liberation movement in the agrarian countries is played by the peasantry?

To answer this question it is necessary to dwell, if only briefly, on the character of this social class. The peasants are not only the biggest of the political forces taking part in the present-day African revolution but the oldest, having arisen in the feudal era. By virtue of its origin and present position of small owner, the peasantry is tied by many strings to the archaic forms of farming, and is distinguished for its outdated views and concepts, religious prejudices, and patriarchal traditions and customs.

With the development of capitalism and the appearance of new classes—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—the peasantry finds itself squeezed in between them. As Lenin pointed out, "the peasants, who had been disunited and downtrodden in feudal times, were converted partly (the majority) into proletarians, and partly (the minority) into wealthy peasants who themselves hired labourers and who constituted a rural bourgeoisie".[1]

Because of the peasantry's dual social position, there are two opposing trends in it: proletarian and bourgeois. The peasants' social heterogeneity, which grows along with the development of capitalism, prevents them from uniting in a single class with the same economic, political and ideological basis. One can speak of the peasantry as a single whole only in referring to the initial stage of the African national liberation revolution, when the struggle was spearheaded against colonialism and feudalism and affected all peasant strata in like manner. But as soon as the question arises of redistributing land, of opposing exploitation not only by feudal elements but by the national bourgeoisie, which has in the meantime become economically strong, and of confronting other problems affecting the socio-economic aspects of the countryside, there appears a profound difference in the positions of the diverse peasant strata and groups.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 477.

The peasants, who are in the middle of the road, as it were, need a political leader. During the struggle for national liberation this role was often played by the national bourgeoisie (and in some cases even by patriotically-minded feudals). Incidentally, this may also be explained by the fact that in the initial phase of the national liberation movement the peasants' struggle did not transcend the bounds of bourgeois democratic demands.

In Africa, this movement cannot but be the bourgeois democratic in nature if only because the mass motive force is the peasantry. But this does not mean at all that the positions of the peasantry and the national bourgeoisie are identical. The peasantry differs fundamentally from the bourgeoisie in that it does not stand for the absolute preservation of private property. And although that does not make it socialist and it does not cease being petty bourgeois by its class status, it nevertheless, as Lenin pointed out, "is capable of becoming a wholehearted and most radical adherent of the democratic revolution. The peasantry will inevitably become such if only the course of revolutionary events, which brings it enlightenment, is not prematurely cut short by the treachery of the bourgeoisie and the defeat of the proletariat".[1]

The peasant movement has made a heavy imprint on the national liberation struggle by its socio-economic and political demands and its specific ideological concepts. There are new conditions and possibilities arising for the upsurge of the peasant movement at the present stage of the African revolution.

First, the feudal relations against which the peasants are chiefly fighting are very far from having been eliminated. The feudal landowner class and the tribal aristocracy have retained pretty strong positions in the African countryside.

Second, the revolutionary activity of the peasantry, especially of its semi-proletarian masses, grows in the present conditions because the national liberation movement in Africa is confronted with the increasingly urgent need to carry out not only general democratic but anti-capitalist reforms. Especially important in this period is

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 98.

the problem of alliance between the working class and the peasantry since it is one of the decisive factors of the successful implementation of progressive transformations in the newly-free African countries and of their advance along the path of genuine social progress. This alliance is now not only anti-feudal but, to a certain extent, anti-capitalist. The realisation of the progressive anti-capitalist tendencies towards the transformation of the developing African society along the socialist lines—and these tendencies are inherent in the African peoples' national liberation movement—depends wholly on the strength of this alliance. Such an alliance will allow to consummate the African revolution and make the newly-free African peoples' advance to socialism more confident and purposeful.

The strength of the peasant movement lies in its indissoluble links with the proletariat's revolutionary struggle. Only the working class can deliver the peasants from the feudal landowners' fetters and capitalist exploitation, no one else, to quote Lenin, "can give the peasantry *everything* in the sphere of agrarian reforms—*everything* that the peasants desire, dream of, and truly need".[1] Only in alliance with the working class and under its political leadership can proper use be made of the peasantry's vast revolutionary energy that can be directed towards satisfying its vital demands.

The most active and consistent force of the African revolution is the *working class*. Although it is still young, the working class is an active participant in the anti-imperialist national liberation movement.

The working class is playing an increasingly important role in the public affairs of the newly-free African countries at the present stage of the African revolution. Its influence as a political force is growing steadily.

Observers are apt at times to go to the extremes in appraising the role the working class plays in the national liberation movement. Some tend to underestimate this role and to exaggerate the revolutionary potentialities of the other forces, namely, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie. Others erroneously affirm that proletariat is alone capable of taking revolutionary action and thus underesti-

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 98.

mate the revolutionary potentialities of the other social forces taking part in the anti-imperialist revolution.

The first tendency is fraught with the danger of overestimating the revolutionary potentialities of the non-proletarian, particularly petty bourgeois, elements in the national liberation movement, to ascribe to this movement, which on the whole remains within the bounds of general democratic development, the socialist traits which it so far does not possess. The second tendency leads to passive waiting for the working class to assume the leadership of the movement, to attempts to force upon this movement the purely proletarian forms and methods of struggle which most of its participants will not accept. This tendency also leads to the isolation of the working class from the other revolutionary and progressive forces and hampers the formation of a single national democratic anti-imperialist front.

In order properly to understand the role of the working class in the national liberation revolution it is necessary to study such things as the character and numerical strength of the proletariat, the changes in its composition and structure, its relations with other classes and social groups. Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that the tendency of today may turn into a decisive factor of the newly-free countries' socio-economic and political development tomorrow.

It is rather difficult to determine the numerical strength of the proletariat in the African countries. First, because there are no statistics for all the countries. More often than not, official statistics are based on the results of selective surveys. As a rule, workers employed at small enterprises are not covered by surveys. The classification of workers is not always clear. Consequently, the data on the numerical strength and composition of the working class are usually approximate.

But even incomplete data reveal a rather substantial numerical growth of the working class in the last twenty years in almost all the African countries, attended by considerable changes in its structure and composition. In some emergent African countries the number of hired workers has doubled and even trebled since the prewar days. In Nigeria it increased from 227,400 in 1938 to 472,600 in 1959, in Tanganyika from 207,100 in 1938 to 404,000 in

1960, in Kenya from 172,800 in 1938 to 594,000 in 1965, etc.[1]

The bulk of the hired workers in African countries are engaged in small-scale production. More than half of them are employed in cottage-type industries. The rest include all other categories of the working class: industrial proletariat, including miners and transport workers, agricultural proletariat, building workers, and workers of the service industries.

The numerical strength of the industrial proletariat is increasing noticeably in the African countries which embarked on the path of industrialisation after achieving political independence. The economic development plans envisage a further increase in the numerical strength of the working class and its nucleus, the industrial proletariat.

But although the establishment and development of the national industry in the years of independence have led to the growth of the industrial proletariat, its proportion is still relatively small, particularly in the countries practically untouched by industrialisation. As before, the factory proletariat there consists chiefly of miners and workers of small enterprises engaged in the primary processing of local raw materials. All in all, the industrial proletariat accounts for 10-15 per cent of the total African proletariat.

A large segment of the African working class is accounted for by the agricultural proletariat employed on plantations and capitalist farms. These are the tillers for whom permanent work for others is an economic necessity. Of about 6.2 million hired workers in the African countries south of the Sahara towards the end of the colonial era, approximately 2.3 million, or 37 per cent, were farm labourers.[2] This proportion remains in many African countries to this day.

The big changes which have occurred in the life of the African nations since independence have to a certain extent affected the position of the proletariat. An eight-

---

[1] *Africa Labour Survey*, Geneva, 1958, p. 666; *Year Book of Labour Statistics, 1962*, Geneva, 1962, pp. 80, 82; *Year Book of Labour Statistics, 1967*, Geneva, 1967 p, 276.

[2] *Agrarian Question and Peasantry in Tropical Africa*, Moscow, 1964, p. 202.

hour working day has been introduced in many countries and in some the wages of certain categories of workers have been raised somewhat, the sphere of operation of labour legislation has been extended, working conditions and social insurance have been improved, and in a number of cases the working class has forced the government to promulgate laws extending the rights of the trade unions, etc.

The material lot of the working class and other breadwinners is still hard in many countries. The wages are low, in some places even at the colonial level. Very often workers employed at modern enterprises and producing as much as the workers of the developed capitalist countries receive only a fraction of what the latter get. There is a vast gap in the wages of skilled and unskilled workers. The low level of development of the productive forces and the abundance of cheap manpower exert pressure on the labour market and hold back the growth of wages.

The workers in the African countries which have not freed themselves from colonial slavery are in an especially bad plight. Thomas Hodgkin, well-known British specialist in African affairs, wrote that the colonialists "justified" low wages on the ground that African labour was "inefficient". But, he rightly said, this "inefficiency is itself in a large part the consequence of the existing levels of earnings".[1]

As a result of the incessant rise of commodity prices of essential consumer goods, real wages have dropped considerably almost everywhere in the last few years. The wage increases workers manage to wrest in bitter strike struggle simply cannot keep up with the price increase. The sharp increase in cost of living is a characteristic feature of many African countries.

There are many African countries where hundreds of thousands of people have no jobs at all. Official statistics do not take into account concealed unemployment, a state in which vast masses of workers, having lost their jobs in the towns, return to villages or when, finding that they cannot be employed in agriculture, they go to the indus-

---

[1] Thomas Hodgkin, *Nationalism in Colonial Africa*, London, 1956, p. 120.

trial centres and learn that there is no work for them there either. So comes into existence a many-million-strong reserve army of labour. The employers take advantage of this fact to keep the wages down.

The working people's low living standard is due first and foremost to the fact that the foreign monopolies, which have preserved strong economic positions in the African countries, continue to plunder their national riches. At the same time, the representatives of the privileged classes are trying to shift the difficulties engendered by the economic development of the newly-free countries on to the shoulders of the working population and so avoid losses.

The proletariat's position, its structure and composition have their own specific traits in every African country. But there are also many features common to all the African working class, features that distinguish it from the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries.

1. Numerical weakness of the working class, due to the low level of industrial development in most parts of Africa, and the consequent insignificant proportion of the industrial proletariat. Predominance of the working-class detachments linked with small-scale cottage-type production.

2. High percentage of the agricultural proletariat employed at plantations and capitalist farms.

3. Predominance of unskilled and semi-skilled workers and small percentage of regular workers. Proletariat's close ties with land and farming, considerable drift of manpower.

4. Vast differences in wages which are generally kept at a very low level.

5. Existence of serious national, religious and tribal differences which retard the growth of the proletariat's class-consciousness.

Such are the traits most common to the entire young African proletariat, and the all-round consideration of these traits makes it possible to understand the peculiarities inherent in the development of the working-class movement on this continent.

One of the peculiarities of the African working-class movement is that it has been directed against imperialism and colonialism from its very inception. And so the strug-

gle waged by the working class has always been of a clearly-defined political nature.

It was this struggle which made the revolutionary liberation movement massive and militant. It left its imprint on the development of the African national liberation revolution, in the course of which specific proletarian methods of struggle—from stoppages and general strikes to armed uprisings—were sometimes employed.

The proletariat of the African countries played an outstanding role in the establishment of sovereign states. It co-operated actively and wholeheartedly with all the patriotic forces participating in the national liberation revolution.

A new stage in the history of the African working-class movement began with the conquest of political independence. The tasks confronting the working class became more complex. What makes them so is that the African proletariat is actually forced to fight on two fronts: against foreign monopolies, its main enemy, and their allies in the newly-free countries. While the working class regards acquisition of political independence as a very important but only the first step towards the social liberation of the working people from all forms of exploitation, the privileged segments of the local bourgeoisie see in it a possibility to strengthen their class positions and to go on receiving big profits by preserving the old forms and methods of exploiting working people.

In the present conditions there are a number of factors influencing the development of the African proletariat and its struggle against imperialism and local reaction, the shaping of its world outlook and class-consciousness.

First, the process of industrialisation is going apace in many newly-independent African countries. Some of them are building modern enterprises at which a new—for most of the African countries—class of industrial workers is coming into existence. The industrial proletariat will grow and develop with industrialisation and will play an increasingly important role in these countries' socio-economic and political life.

Second, the formation of the modern working class in the sovereign African countries and the growth of its political awareness go hand in hand with the growth of the masses' urge for socialism. This is of exceptional signi-

ficance, for it creates auspicious conditions for a more rapid development of the working class into an influential force, into the force that will build a new society.

The ideologues of the national bourgeoisie are naturally trying to implant the kind of "national socialism" that would camouflage the bourgeois nature of their countries' development. Nevertheless, the proclamation of socialist aims, followed up by the implementation of really progressive socio-economic reforms in a number of progressive African countries, has created an absolutely new situation which objectively facilitates the proletariat's advance to the forefront and enhances its political role in the national liberation movement.

Third, the expansion and consolidation of the African proletariat's international ties and the development of the class struggle in the world arena are enhancing its class-consciousness and its realisation of the role it plays in the process of national and social regeneration. The international ties of the young African proletariat are expanding and growing stronger despite the efforts made in some African countries in recent years to undermine its growing links with world socialism and with the revolutionary working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries. And this cannot but exert a beneficent influence on the formation of proletarian ideology and politics.

There are, however, quite a few obstacles and objective difficulties on the path of the development of the working class and working-class movement in the African countries. The greater part of the working class in these countries is made up of people whom it would be more correct to call semi-proletarians, people who maintain close ties with land and their small farms. Migration of manpower has assumed wide proportions there. Every year a huge army of migratory workers leaves the countryside in search of work in towns. According to some estimates, there were at least five million migratory workers in tropical Africa at the end of the 1950s.[1] In Salisbury, capital of Rhodesia, 76 per cent of the labour force remain on an average 4.4 months in each job and 80 per cent of all workers are forced to change jobs every year.[2] British

[1] *Africa in Transition*, London, 1958, p. 42.
[2] *African Labour Survey*, Geneva, 1958, p. 145.

sociologist Walter Elkan, who studied migration of manpower in Uganda, made inquiries at some twenty industrial enterprises and came to the conclusion that it was the common practice among workers to be employed only temporarily and, sooner or later, to return to their villages. Less than 20 per cent of the unskilled workers lived in town continuously for five years or more. The percentage in the other countries of tropical Africa was even lower. And so he warned that it was wrong to equate the growth of towns, which had undoubtedly taken place in Africa, with the growth of an urban or industrial proletariat.[1]

The extensive movement of labour and the workers' traditionally strong ties with the countryside help promote the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and create favourable conditions for the rural working masses and the workers of the cottage-type industries to adhere to the system of hired labour and help gradually to shape their proletarian consciousness. At the same time, the predominance of the peasant elements within the working class is fraught with the danger of penetration into the working-class movement of petty bourgeois ideology, of religious, tribal, caste and other prejudices which are used by the employers to set various groups and strata of the working class against one another.

Attention should also be drawn to such a fact as the corruptive influence of the policy followed by the imperialist monopolies with the view to breeding a labour aristocracy by giving hand-outs to a certain section of the working population and then using it to prevent the unity of the working class.

Despite all difficulties and the complex conditions in which it is forced to wage struggle, the working-class movement in the African countries is gaining strength. The workers' actions are becoming more massive and organised.

The level of labour organisation is rising. There were practically no trade unions in Africa prior to the Second World War (the only countries that had them were Egypt,

---

[1] Walter Elkan, *Migrants and Proletarians. Urban Labour in the Economic Development of Uganda*, London, 1960, pp. 3-4.

Tunisia, Algeria and South Africa). Now there are most probably no countries that have no trade unions. The African unions unite about 30 per cent of the hired workers.

The growth of the level of trade-union organisation and of the influence of the trade unions entails the expansion of the proletariat's economic and political activity. Realising that the trade unions play a very important role in the affairs of the developing countries, the ideologues of imperialism take steps to prevent the unity of the trade-union movement on both national and international scale, to turn the trade unions into instruments of neo-colonialist policy. The Right-wing leaders of the American unions allot large sums for training and bribing trade-union leaders in African countries to propagate US policies on the continent. In 1957, for instance, the AFL-CIO allocated $50,000 to help train East African trade-union leaders, some of whom came to the United States for that purpose.[1]

The young African working-class movement is making considerable headway. Striving for the satisfaction of its vital economic requirements and upholding its class interests, the African proletariat is coming out ever more resolutely for the broad democratic rights it had formally won in the course of the long national liberation struggle against imperialism, for the right to have its trade unions and political parties. This struggle is meeting with the understanding and winning the support of the broad masses of peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals, and this creates real possibilities for the formation of a single national democratic front in the struggle against imperialism, for national liberation and social progress. Keeping step with the nation and upholding general democratic demands, the working class follows an independent and active policy on cardinal questions relating to the development of the national liberation movement. This is dictated not only by the vital interests of the working people of the given country but by the principles of proletarian internationalism.

---

[1] George C. Lodge, *Spearheads of Democracy. Labor in the Developing Countries*, New York, 1962, p. 84.

The future of the African national liberation revolution will to a large extent depend on the level of the proletariat's organisation and unity, on the strength of its alliance with the non-proletarian masses, notably the peasants. The revolutionary movement in different countries and parts of the world shows that the best and the most effective way of drawing the peasants into struggle against imperialism and for genuine progress lies through the establishment of a solid alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

The profound changes taking place in the position of the African proletariat are enhancing its authority and political influence. The economic conditions prevailing in the countries of Africa are preparing the working class to become the leader of all working people. While the development of capitalism divides the peasantry, just as it does all the petty bourgeois strata in general, in the case of the proletariat it is a factor leading to its unity and organisation and enhancing its class-consciousness.

But even in countries with a relatively developed working class the proletariat's hegemony in the national liberation movement should not be regarded as something "secure", as something predetermined once and for all. It is won in struggle. The decision of when and how fast the working class can assume leadership depends on the situation in the given country, on the strength of its influence on the masses, on how well it succeeds in winning over the non-proletarian forces—the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and other social groups—which are also interested in the further development of the national liberation revolution even though they do not accept the proletariat's ideology and methods of struggle. These forces must accumulate their own experience of political struggle, and that takes time. Practice shows that the forcing of this process will merely slow down the development of the national liberation revolution.

The analysis of the working-class movement in Africa confirms the following statement made by CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969: "There is no doubt that in the young national states ahead lies the broadest development of the working-class struggle against imperialism and its allies. It is the working-

class movement that will ultimately play the decisive part in this area of the world too."[1]

One of the distinctive traits of the present stage of the national liberation movement in Africa is that the leading role in it is being assumed more and more by the urban *middle strata,* whose political activity has grown sharply of late.

The urban middle strata account for a relatively large percentage of the population of the African countries. They include handicraftsmen, artisans, small tradesmen and other small entrepreneurs, intellectuals (including officers), and a segment of civil servants.

By their property and social status, the urban middle strata in the developing African countries, unlike those in the developed capitalist countries, are closer to the working masses than to the well-to-do. Ruthlessly exploited in the recent past by the foreign monopolies, the middle strata took an active part in the national liberation movement, being vitally interested in the independent development of their countries.

The dual economic nature of the petty owners is not so manifest here, in the conditions of mass poverty, as it is in the industrially developed countries.

Sometimes the urban middle strata are characterised as the so-called middle classes. Such a definition is scientifically wrong, in our opinion, not only because the middle classes have no single economic basis but also because they represent a whole lot of different social groups which hold a specific and highly unstable position in society. This is due to their social heterogeneity which gives rise to a wide range of political positions—from extreme reactionism to progressiveness and high-level revolutionism. The task of the genuine revolutionary forces is to help discover and develop in the middle strata such qualities and trends as revolutionism and progressiveness, and at the same time to neutralise the reactionary trends.

It was at one time claimed that because of the position they occupied between the two class poles in bourgeois society and the resultant vacillation and inconsistency, the middle strata presented well-nigh the greatest danger to

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969,* p. 153.

the revolutionary movement. And so the conclusion often drawn was that there could be no question of the proletariat's reconcilability with these strata. But the national liberation movement and the realities in the newly-free African countries prove that the proletarian forces' close alliance with the middle strata is not only possible but indispensable for the success of the anti-imperialist revolution. This does not mean of course that contradictoriness, predisposition towards compromise with imperialism and local reaction, etc., cease to be the inherent traits of the middle strata.

With the right treatment and skilful ideological influence the urban middle strata turn out to be capable not only of carrying out progressive socio-economic and basically anti-capitalist reforms but of taking, in certain circumstances, the path of scientific socialism. This conclusion is based on the realistic consideration of the substantial differences in the socio-economic and political positions of these strata in the developed capitalist countries and the newly-free developing countries.

Whereas in the developed capitalist countries the growth of large-scale production is driving small producers out of business, the economic significance of the small-commodity sector in the African countries is growing. Due to the low level of capitalist development there, large-scale production exists peacefully side by side with small-scale production. Polish economist Jerzy Kleer was undoubtedly right when he affirmed that "such relatively conflict-free coexistence will continue for a long time yet".[1] Proceeding from this concept, he justly noted that "the influence exerted by the strata of the population linked with small-scale production on the state's socio-economic activity in the countries of the Third World will be greater than in the developed countries".[2]

Moreover, as pointed out above, the economic position of the urban middle strata differs little from that of the working people. And in some cases they live even worse than industrial workers. All this should be taken into account in appraising the role the urban middle strata play

---

[1] Jerzy Kleer, *Analysis of the Socio-Economic Structures of the Third World Countries*, Moscow, 1968, Russ. ed., p. 163.
[2] Ibid.

in the socio-political life of the emergent African countries.

Very active in these countries is the national intelligentsia. To a large extent, it was moulded and is still being moulded beyond the boundaries of its own country. While studying abroad, the intellectuals also imbibe the most diverse ideas (both progressive and reactionary) on the basis of which they later develop their political creeds. On their return home, they usually become leaders of political parties, trade unions and all sorts of cultural, educational and other organisations, and directly influence the shaping of national consciousness.

One must especially dwell on the nature of the military stratum and the army's influence on political affairs in the African countries. The military coups in Africa compel one to return to the problems relating to the army's role and place in the national liberation movement and to its influence on the political life of the young sovereign states in Africa.

There are different opinions about the army's role in the national liberation movement. Some authors claim that its role is not progressive and that the political power it sets up as a result of military coups is reactionary and militarist. Others, on the contrary, see the army as wellnigh the only national force capable of guiding the national liberation revolution. Sometimes it is even said that the army is capable of directing the political and economic development of the newly-free countries all by itself, without the assistance of the broad working masses and without there being a progressive political party.

The appraisal of the army's role in the national liberation movement requires, as does any other social phenomenon, a class approach. The army's place in society is determined by the nature of society itself, by the alignment of class and political forces, the level and scope of the revolutionary movement. In a class society, the revolutionary struggle of the working masses invariably involves the army in the whirlpool of political events. As Lenin stressed, "the troops cannot be, have never been, and will never be neutral".[1]

Africa is no exception. The history of the national liberation movement on this continent shows that the army

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 465.

is not neutral, that it actively intervenes in the political affairs in the country and often decisively influences events. There are a number of reasons for this.

First, in countries where the basic classes are not sufficiently developed an objectively bigger role is played by the middle strata, notably by the intellectuals, both civilian and military, who acquire relatively greater independence towards the classes than in countries with a mature class structure.

Second, whereas in the developed capitalist countries the army is the most conservative element of society, in the countries with backward industry it is the most enlightened and dynamic force. This is explained by the fact that the military deal with modern equipment and learn to handle it; they often have to go abroad, where they come into contact with their counterparts in developed countries and familiarise themselves with the achievements of world civilisation. That is why the military are the first to see the negative aspects of their countries' technical and economic backwardness. They acutely feel the need for socio-economic changes and seek to remove from the power the political forces which, in their opinion, do not recognise the need for such changes or oppose them. True, the military themselves do not always have a clear-cut socio-economic programme.

Third, the army, early imbued with ideas of freedom, did not stand aloof from the struggle for national liberation. In many African countries the national armies came into existence during the revolutionary liberation struggle and, consequently, were an anti-imperialist, progressive force from their very inception. This was so, for instance, in Algeria, where the National Liberation Army, consisting of poor peasants, workers and representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, waged an anti-colonial war which accorded with the interests and aspirations of all Algerian people.

Fourth, both in the struggle for national liberation and to a still greater extent after the acquisition of state sovereignty the political parties were in many cases unable to exert a decisive influence on their countries' development.

In most African countries, the parties coming to power were more like organisations of the national front type that united socially, politically and ideologically heteroge-

neous forces. As a rule, there was no effective discipline in these parties. It is only natural that they were not ready to tackle the incomparably more complex tasks confronting the people after the conquest of independence. That is why the army, being the most organised and disciplined force, found itself on the crest of political events.

At the same time it would be a mistake, both in theory and in practice, not to see that the army's position in the emergent countries and its functions undergo substantial changes with the development of the national liberation movement, when the stress is on the solution of socio-economic tasks. The military leaders that come to power thanks to the army, whose activity is based chiefly on orders and instructions, begin to realise that the army cannot take the place of society's democratic institutions, without which a national revolution cannot progress.

In Africa, many military leaders convinced themselves more and more that the army could not replace the party as the guiding force of society because it did not have a clear-cut political and ideological platform and lacked experience in politically organising the masses and directing economic development. They understood that without the active participation of the working people and their foremost detachments it was impossible to build a new life and wage a victorious struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

And so the progressive-minded officers, backed by the masses, firmly embarked upon the path of developing the national liberation revolution and carrying out the socio-economic reforms that paved the way to the next stage of their country's social progress.

The officers that were under the influence of imperialist and local reaction either adopted a wait-and-see attitude or openly opposed the revolution. The military coups in African countries show that the army can play a progressive role in the national liberation movement but can also easily become a tool of the reactionary forces if it falls under their influence.

Thus, in some cases the army accelerates the progress of the newly-free countries and in others, on the contrary, it retards this progress.

It should also be borne in mind that in certain instances the leaders of military coups are guided solely by personal

ambitions. The imperialists closely watch the development of such tendencies in the army and try to use them to further their neo-colonialist aims. One cannot but see, for instance, the connection between military coups in some African countries and the subversive activities there of the imperialist powers, which stake a great deal on the army. They skilfully take advantage of the fact that the character and the composition of the army in many African countries changes very little since the withdrawal of the colonialists. Most of the armies remain composed of mercenaries and the soldiers are actually educated and trained by Western instructors.

The underestimation of political work in the army and the opinion that the army is a force that does not engage in politics may have harmful consequences for the destiny of the national revolution. This point is increasingly stressed by many leaders of the national liberation movement.

The army is not in itself a class, nor does it stand above class. It is an instrument of a definite class. "In every class society", Lenin wrote, "...the oppressor class is always armed."[1] An army can fulfil a progressive mission only if it serves the interests of the people. The national liberation movement shows that the only representatives of the military intelligentsia to win real recognition and respect are those who have tied their lot to that of the fighting people.

In Africa, the national bourgeoisie fought side by side with the other classes and social groups for political independence.

In some countries it led the anti-imperialist national liberation movement. The progressive nature of the national bourgeoisie is determined by its anti-imperialist position. This position fully accords with its class interests, for in the conditions of colonial rule they are impinged upon by foreign monopolies.

In Lenin's opinion, the distinctive trait of the national bourgeoisie lay in the fact that, unlike the monopoly bourgeoisie of the imperialist powers which, as a class, was no longer revolutionary and had turned into a reactionary force, the national bourgeoisie had not exhausted its

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 80.

progressive and revolutionary potentialities. Referring to this trait, Lenin wrote: "In 'advanced' Europe, the *sole advanced* class is the proletariat. As for the living bourgeoisie, it is prepared to go to any length of savagery, brutality and crime in order to uphold dying capitalist slavery.

"And a more striking example of this decay of the *entire* European bourgeoisie can scarcely be cited than the support it is lending to *reaction* in Asia in furtherance of the selfish aims of the financial manipulators and capitalist swindlers.

"Everywhere in Asia a mighty democratic movement is growing, spreading and gaining in strength. The bourgeoisie there is *as yet* siding with the people against reaction."[1]

A proper understanding of the nature and role of the national bourgeoisie helps the revolutionary and democratic forces in the African countries that have freed or are freeing themselves to strive for the anti-imperialist unity of all progressive, democratic and revolutionary forces.

It would be wrong, however, to idealise the national bourgeoisie and to ignore its negative traits. The national liberation movement shows that it is inconsistent and prone to compromise with imperialism and feudalism. Although the general trend of development of the national liberation movement allows the national bourgeoisie to play a progressive role in it, it is nevertheless impermissible to ignore the fact that the negative aspects of the conduct of the national bourgeoisie manifest themselves more and more with the development of the national liberation revolution.

The role of the national bourgeoisie is not always interpreted objectively correctly because there is as yet no clear-cut and sufficiently scientific definition of the concept of "national bourgeoisie". Some still think that the national bourgeoisie is essentially the middle bourgeoisie.[2]

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 99-100.

[2] This point of view is based on Mao Tse-tung's definition which says that the middle class is the "national bourgeoisie" (Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, London, 1954, p. 14). He insists that the big bourgeoisie is in all cases the comprador bourgeoisie. "Among the bourgeoisie," he writes, "there is the distinc-

The national bourgeoisie is the part of the local bourgeoisie that stands for the country's independent economic and political development, is interested in expanding the domestic market and in creating and developing national productive forces, and strives to be independent of imperialism both within the country and in the international arena. It is not very important either to what sphere of economic activity national capital is applied—industry, trade or services.

In Africa, the national bourgeoisie consists chiefly of tradespeople. The development of the industrial bourgeoisie there was retarded by the presence of the numerically strong European bourgeoisie. This especially applied to the African countries where there were numerous European settlements (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, etc.). In East and Central Africa the national bourgeoisie is less developed than in West Africa, where there were considerably fewer permanent European settlements.

One should not include in the national bourgeoisie the part of the local bourgeoisie that acts as an agent for the imperialist monopolies, helps strengthen the neo-colonialist yoke and betrays the national interests of its country. This section of the bourgeoisie—it would be more apt to call it pro-imperialist bourgeoisie—withdraws more and more from anti-imperialist positions and turns into a business partner of imperialism and neo-colonialism in the joint exploitation of the emergent nations.

Another reliable ally of imperialism is the corrupt bureaucratic bourgeoisie, which constitutes the so-called bureaucratic capital. This is a development that is becoming increasingly manifest in a number of newly-free countries. The so-called bureaucratic bourgeoisie is formed of the privileged section of highly-paid government officials who have drawn away from the people and are in fact not interested in the development of the national liberation movement. Their maintenance absorbs huge sums and that imposes a heavy burden on countries with limited budget resources. The excessively inflated bureaucratic machine demands colossal unproductive outlays. This is not only

---

tion between the big bourgeoisie of the comprador character and the national bourgeoisie" (ibid., Vol. 3, p. 881). Such division in no way fits into the present conditions in most of the developing countries, and not only in Africa but Asia too.

an economic problem. It is also of major political significance. For, insofar as the bureaucratic bourgeoisie is concerned, the revolution ends with its advent to power. After that its efforts are directed chiefly towards retaining lucrative posts.

This segment, the bulk of which is formed by representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, is a sort of product of colonial rule, and the imperialists rely on it.

There is a growing realisation in many newly-free African countries that the nascent elite, which is concerned only about its own well-being and is ready to co-operate with neo-colonialism to secure it, is incapable of ensuring their political and economic stability, for such a stability, as it is rightly pointed out in *The New Elites of Tropical Africa*, is inconceivable without "tangible improvements in their (the masses') standards of living" and "a demonstrable degree of upward social mobility".[1]

The national bourgeoisie is heterogeneous in its composition. The interests and the views of its different sections (lower, middle and upper) do not always coincide. Here we are witnessing a dual process in Africa. On the one hand, in many African countries the national bourgeoisie is only taking shape as a class; on the other, it is going rather fast through the process of differentiation under the impact of both internal and external factors. The differences between the various strata of the national bourgeoisie are manifest not only in their economic inequality but in their different approach to political problems. Moreover, the political views of any part of the bourgeoisie do not always directly reflect its social-class and economic position but depend on the character and sharpness of the class struggle within the country.

As the contradictions between the working people and the propertied classes are growing sharper and the class struggle within the country becomes more bitter, the national bourgeoisie tends to compromise with imperialism. The urge to curb the demands of the masses leads to attempts to abolish democratic freedoms, for the national bourgeoisie fears broad democratisation of the social system and, to prevent it, it is ready to enter into alliance with the forces it fought only yesterday.

[1] *The New Elites of Tropical Africa*, Ed. by P. C. Lloyd, London, 1966, p. 339.

Nevertheless, the contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and imperialism remain sharp as ever and so its participation in the present phase of the national liberation movement is objectively possible. Because of the dual character of the national bourgeoisie, its participation in the national liberation revolution depends on the concrete conditions in the given country: on the correlation of the class forces, the sharpness of the contradictions between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie, and the struggle of the masses.

The traits common to the national bourgeoisie as a class in any country should not make us blind to the peculiarities of the national bourgeoisie of different countries. An objective analysis of the character and role of the national bourgeoisie in the national liberation movement and the all-round consideration of the trends inherent in it precludes Right-opportunist and Left-sectarian mistakes due to the underestimation or overestimation of the national bourgeoisie's revolutionism.

* * *

Such are the main motive forces of the African revolution. The alignment of class and social forces in the concrete conditions of a given country naturally has its specific traits. In some countries there is no national bourgeoisie or it is just coming into existence, no national industry, and the national proletariat is still in the process of formation. Moreover, there are numerous intermediate strata whose attitude to the African revolution is predetermined by the prevailing conditions in the given country. In many African countries, class formation is still in progress and the distinctions between the classes and social groups are varied and changeable. But the recognition of this fact gives no ground to say that the Marxist-Leninist theory of the classes and class struggle is inapplicable to the newly-free African countries.

Though it has its own specific traits, class formation in Africa is governed by the same laws as in other countries and parts of the world. And there is no doubt that class differences and contradictions will become more manifest and class struggle more intensive as African society and the African revolution develop.

STRUGGLE FOR ECONOMIC EMANCIPATION

As the post-war development of the African countries has shown, acquisition of state sovereignty does not solve automatically or quickly the problem of eliminating their economic backwardness. Political independence is merely the first, though very important, step on the way to genuine independence, which is of course inconceivable without economic emancipation.

It would therefore be wrong to draw a line between the efforts made by the newly-free states to create and develop their economies and the political struggle against imperialism, and to claim that this is leading to the "abolition" of the national liberation movement. On the contrary, ignoring socio-economic problems may weaken political independence and make it easier for imperialism to deal counterblows against the national liberation movement.

The economy is the sphere of life in which the interests of the different classes and social groups clash directly and most sharply and which ultimately determines the content of the socio-economic and political processes in the African countries. Economic questions are widely discussed in the newly-free African countries, particularly such an urgent problem as that of narrowing down as quickly as possible, and even eliminating, the gap between the industrially developed and the economically backward countries, of creating optimum conditions for the solution of this socio-economic task.

There is perhaps no country in Africa that is not suffering from economic difficulties today. What is the nature of these difficulties and what are their causes? Different countries have different difficulties, of course. And yet there are moments common to all the newly-free African countries. One of them is the slow rate of growth of in-

dustrial and agricultural production and the consequent material plight of the population.

The rate of economic development increased noticeably in a number of African countries in the early years of their political independence. The annual increment of industrial production ranged from 6 to 11 per cent. Besides the increase in the gross volume of production of the basic industrial goods there was a certain increase in per capita output.

This was followed by a decline in economic activity and in the last few years economic development has been displaying a tendency to decelerate.

United Nations experts have calculated that per capita industrial production in Africa (not counting the Republic of South Africa) is but one-twenty fifth that in the developed capitalist countries. The per capita national income is almost thirty times less. The annual gross product of the African countries (again without the RSA) comes to less than 2 per cent of the cost of the gross product of the capitalist world, although Africa accounts for 8 per cent of the world's population. These figures reflecting the general economic position of the African countries naturally vary from country to country. But on the whole they probably correctly reflect the tendency testifying to the continuing growth of the gap between the developing African countries and the developed capitalist countries.

There are all sorts of theories advanced to explain the economic difficulties many African countries are suffering. The capitalist West is again circulating the old version about the Africans' "incapability" to run their own affairs, notably to manage economic processes which require special knowledge and well-trained specialists. Some bourgeois economists seek to prove that economic difficulties are experienced only by the countries that have embarked upon the path of social progress.

The ideologues of neo-colonialism are almost sure that economic difficulties will shape the situation in Africa in favour of the capitalist West. Expressing this sentiment, the London weekly *Economist* wrote that "the tide is running the West's way in Asia and Africa" and added that "the present generation of African and Asian rulers may be readier than some of their predecessors were to work along with the West, to use Western aid in what the

aid-givers think the most efficient way, and even to give their home-grown capitalists the benefit of the doubt".[1]

These and other similar arguments advanced by the bourgeois economists are designed to conceal the main thing and that is that the newly-free African countries inherited a backward economy and undeveloped social relations from colonialism. These difficulties are not unexpected. They are due above all to the extremely backward economy, the exceptionally low level of development of the productive forces, the very strong economic dependence on the imperialist monopolies, and the acute shortage of resources and specialists in all the branches of the economy. The newly-independent African states are compelled not simply to improve the former structure but to destroy it and to build a new national economic system in its stead. Besides vast effort and bold actions, this requires time.

The fact that the African anti-imperialist national liberation revolution is taking place in countries with a backward socio-economic structure cannot but affect their economic activity. And the more economically and socially backward the country and the more pernicious the legacy it received from colonialism, the more complex economic problems it has to solve and the more effort it has to put in to achieve the level of industrially developed states. Moreover, the mechanism of the economic exploitation of the former colonies and semi-colonies, elaborated over many decades, continues to function to this day, helping the imperialist monopolies to pump vast riches out of the newly-free countries by making use of their unequal position in the system of the capitalist division of labour.

The imperialist powers' lengthy colonial domination is responsible not only for the economic backwardness of the African countries but for their lopsided agrarian-colonial structure. The only sectors of industry stimulated in the colonial days were those that brought the imperialist monopolies the biggest and quickest profits. The development of the manufacturing industry was deliberately held back. Farming in almost all the African countries was incredibly backward and the rate at which it was drawn into the capitalist system of production was extremely slow.

[1] *The Economist*, March 19, 1966, p. 1100.

The imperialist powers skilfully use the very low level of the African countries' industrial development to preserve the key positions in their economy. It should be stressed in this connection that in a number of cases the imperialist monopolies extend their control and influence to the technically most advanced and the economically most profitable industrial enterprises that exert a big influence on the economic development of the given country. Preservation of the key positions in the economy of the developing countries enables the imperialist monopolies to extend their influence to whole branches of the economy and pocket huge profits while investing only relatively small sums.

Foreign banks in the former African colonies and semicolonies allowed finance capital of the imperialist powers to take advantage of the survivals of feudalism and the backwardness and the economic underdevelopment of the African countries. Soviet economists estimate that the imperialist monopolies receive from 4,000 to 6,000 million dollars a year in profit on the capital invested in the developing African countries.[1] Such plunder naturally exhausts the economic resources of the newly-free countries and deprives them of considerable sums that would otherwise go to develop their economy and raise the standards of living.

Profits accruing to imperialist monopolies from direct capital investments are only part of the losses the African countries sustain as a result of imperialist exploitation. They also suffer huge losses through unequal trade with the former colonial powers. The absolute majority of the African countries have a deficit in their foreign trade. In 1958-60 they exported $16,400 million worth of goods and imported $21,500 million worth. The deficit in just these three years of unequal trade came to $5,100 million.[2]

The system of unequal international division of labour, in which the developing countries play the role of purveyors of raw materials and semi-manufactured goods

---

[1] A. A. Arzumanyan, *Problems of Contemporary Capitalism*, Moscow, 1963, p. 77.

[2] *Economic Bulletin for Africa*, Addis Ababa, Jan. 1962, No. 1, p. A-9.

to the developed imperialist states, the low level of development of the productive forces in the agrarian-raw material countries, on the one hand, and high labour productivity in the industrially developed countries, on the other, lead to the growing exploitation of the former colonies and semi-colonies through unequal trade.

To step up their economic development the newly-independent states must have modern machinery and industrial equipment, which they can acquire in exchange for raw materials. But the profits made by the developing countries on raw materials can in no way compare with the profits made on industrial goods. Moreover, the share of raw materials in world trade is gradually decreasing and their prices are constantly declining. In 1950-1962 the developing countries' receipts from raw-material exports increased on an average by a meagre 3.5 per cent a year which was clearly not enough to meet their requirements in imported industrial equipment and materials.

The imperialist monopolies deliberately keep the prices of industrial goods at a high level and systematically force raw-material prices down. To this one must add that natural raw materials, produced chiefly by the developing countries, are being replaced on an ever growing scale by synthetic materials, produced by the industrially developed countries. It is not at all surprising that the representatives of the African countries at various international and regional economic conferences demand the stabilisation of raw-material prices and easier terms for payments for machinery they import, including a lower interest on credits.

Speaking of the causes of the economic difficulties experienced by the developing African countries, one must mention a number of factors which, though not decisive, make it easier to understand the problem. These are the shortcomings and errors in their economic policy. The desire of the socially and economically undeveloped countries to step up the development of their productive forces is natural. Unfortunately, they do not always take due account of their potentialities and the prevailing conditions. Attempts by countries with a backward economy and undeveloped social relations to "leap" over the necessary stages of development, to pass straight from the lowest to the highest forms of economic management,

to copy the forms and methods of the industrially highly-developed states, may merely enhance disproportions in the economy and create additional economic difficulties. That is exactly what happened in some of them.

A number of newly-independent African countries tried to run all the trade, industrial and transport enterprises, big and small, without waiting until they became economically stronger, without having the necessary resources and specialists. Besides a purely economic aspect, this problem was of considerable political importance, for this measure caused discontent among the middle strata which account for a large percentage of the population of the developing world.

Another factor should also be considered. The development of the national economy inevitably meets with the resistance of certain classes and social groups, for it is impossible to progress without infringing upon their interests. The more radical the socio-economic reforms, the greater their resistance. Very often the privileged classes openly sabotage progressive measures and hamper their implementation.

It was this that prompted the adoption of rather severe measures against the representatives of the privileged strata of society who deliberately sabotaged radical socio-economic measures. It should be pointed out, however, that economic and other sanctions that were not expedient from the economic point of view were taken against middle and especially small entrepreneurs, and this led to economic complications and the aggravation of the political situation in the country. Later it became necessary to renounce some of the hastily adopted economic control measures and return nationalised property (small and some medium-size enterprises) to the former owners. The situation was further aggravated by the fact that the volume of investments in some countries was unjustifiably big and this entailed an increase in taxes that affected chiefly the urban and rural middle strata.

Corruption, waste, desire to enrich oneself at the expense of the state are a real scourge for the economy of certain African countries. Commenting on the causes of the military coup in Nigeria in January 1966, the Manchester *Guardian* wrote: "During a fortnight in Nigeria just now, the stories of corruption went far beyond the sort of

thing one hears in older capitals in the West."[1] Corruption and economic sabotage assumed such proportions in some African countries that they began to affect their economy and made it necessary to take extremely severe steps. In some countries, the penalty for economic crimes—embezzlement of state funds, profiteering, corruption, sabotage at state-operated enterprises, etc.—is hard labour and even death.

Another factor is the absence of stable economic ties among the African countries themselves. Having achieved political independence, many of them made attempts to break loose from economic dependence. The imperialist powers retaliated to this natural urge to develop the national economy either by completely severing economic ties with the former colonies, as was the case, for instance, with Guinea and the Kinshasa Congo, or by sharply curtailing these ties.

And so there appeared a sort of economic vacuum which it was difficult to fill, especially at the beginning. Instituting an economic blockade against some of the newly-free states, the imperialist powers made big efforts to enhance the economic potential of the countries which followed a pro-imperialist policy and pit them against the anti-imperialist states. The following fact will illustrate this. The imperialist monopolies sharply reduced the prices of cocoa beans and caused serious financial difficulties for the government of Ghana. After the military coup in this country, the cocoa prices were substantially raised. Lack of well-organised economic co-operation among the African countries aggravated the economic difficulties in this case.

And the last but not the least factor is that in many African countries the attitude to labour remains what it was in the colonial days, when people were forced to work. Nor is the growth of labour productivity stimulated by the ideas still prevailing in some countries that economic prosperity will come by itself, thanks to assistance from without, without the people having to exert much effort to muster and utilise internal resources. Sometimes it is claimed that the hot tropical climate is one of the main reasons for low labour productivity in these countries. It would be wrong, of course, to underestimate the

[1] *The Guardian*, Jan. 27, 1966.

climatic conditions and their effect on the economy. But the growth of labour productivity and attitude to labour cannot be said to depend directly on the climate and other geographic factors. They are not only economic categories but social as well. And so they must first be considered from a social point of view. The geographic environment remains but the nature of labour and the attitude to it alter with the changes in the social nature of society.

Among the causes we have listed are objective factors engendered by the concrete historical conditions in which the newly-free African countries have found themselves and subjective causes due to the economic policy followed by the political parties in power and by certain national leaders and sometimes to outright mistakes and miscalculations. It would not be right, however, to attribute economic difficulties solely to errors in economic policy. In considering this policy, it is necessary to bear in mind all its aspects and factors, both objective and subjective.

In countries with a backward economic structure and undeveloped social relations the public sector plays one of the leading roles in accelerating the growth of industrial and agricultural production and overcoming their economic backwardness. This sector enables the state:

1. To accumulate financial means and use natural and manpower resources more rationally for building up an independent economy;

2. To fight successfully against the foreign monopolies' domination of the economy, demolish its colonial structure, and promote industrialisation;

3. To concentrate in its hands the key positions in the economy and introduce planning;

4. To develop production on the basis of the achievements of world science and technology;

5. To influence the private sector, gradually restricting its activity and creating prerequisites for the development of new relations of production.

The nature of the public sector and its place and role in the economy are different in each African country and depend first and foremost on the character of state power. In some countries, the public sector, consisting of newly-built enterprises and nationalised property—mainly owned by foreign capital, extends to the key branches of industry and exerts a decisive influence on their economic

development. In other countries, it plays a modest role and practically does little to prevent the development of private enterprise. While in some cases the expansion and consolidation of the public sector are the basic aim of economic policy, in others it is confined to the infrastructure or a few enterprises whose activity exerts little influence on the general state of the economy. Consequently, it is necessary to avoid categorical and, consequently, one-sided appraisals which do not take into account the diversity of complex conditions obtaining in the newly-free African countries.

Indeed, is it possible to affirm that the public sector in all cases is state-capitalist in character? Such a definition is wrong if only because it does not disclose the substantial difference between the state-capitalist forms of economic life in the developing African countries and the forms typical of the industrially developed capitalist states.

What distinguishes the developed capitalist countries is the highly intensive monopoly concentration of production and capital and the merger of the monopolies and the state apparatus. As for the developing countries, the state there is not an instrument of the monopolies. In most cases, the establishment of the public sector in these countries is prompted by the urge to protect themselves against the monopolies' offensive and is objectively directed towards checking their expansion. Consequently, the public sector in the developing countries generally plays a progressive role.

It should be borne in mind, however, that in some African countries the bourgeois elements try to use the public sector to enrich themselves, to create and strengthen their economic basis. All the more so, since the cause of the government's interference in the economy is often the weakness of national capital and not the desire to put the country onto the path of non-capitalist development.

It would, consequently, be wrong to think that the public sector in the developing African countries plays a progressive, anti-imperialist role in all circumstances. There may arise a situation in which it will champion neo-colonialist policies and promote the growth of national capital.

Nor should one disregard the possibility that, under the influence of a wide popular struggle the public sector may turn from an instrument of the national bourgeoisie into

an instrument of the entire nation and help completely reorganise the country's economic structure and promote social progress. To make the public sector serve their interests and help promote the country's economic prosperity, the masses must strive relentlessly to turn it into an instrument of the people. In the final count, everything depends on who is in power and whose interests the state serves, that is, on the alignment of the class forces and the scale and scope of class struggle.

The ideas voiced by Lenin in his report to the Party's Eleventh Congress in 1922 make it easier to understand this problem. "On the question of state capitalism," he said, "I think that generally our press and our Party make the mistake of dropping into intellectualism, into liberalism; we philosophise about how state capitalism is to be interpreted, and look into old books. But in those old books you will not find what we are discussing; they deal with the state capitalism that exists under capitalism. Not a single book has been written about state capitalism under communism. It did not occur even to Marx to write a word on this subject; and he died without leaving a single precise statement or definite instruction on it. That is why we must overcome the difficulty entirely by ourselves. And if we make a general mental survey of our press and see what has been written about state capitalism, as I tried to do when I was preparing this report, we shall be convinced that it is missing the target, that it is looking in an entirely wrong direction."[1]

This, Lenin explained, was because "state capitalism in the form we have here is not dealt with in any theory, or in any books, for the simple reason that all the usual concepts connected with this term are associated with bourgeois rule in capitalist society. Our society is one which has left the rails of capitalism, but has not yet got on to new rails. The state in this society is not ruled by the bourgeoisie, but by the proletariat."[2] Lenin meant that in the conditions in which political power was in the hands of the proletariat, state capitalism was "the capitalism that we can and must permit, that we can and must confine within certain bounds; for this capitalism is es-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 277-78.
[2] Ibid., p. 278.

sential for the broad masses of the peasantry and for private capital, which must trade in such a way as to satisfy the needs of the peasantry."[1]

The conditions in pre-revolutionary Russia naturally differ a great deal from the situation in the African countries. At the same time, in the study of this problem from a methodological point of view, such an analogy is doubtless possible, if one bears in mind that state capitalism or the public sector also takes shape in the developing African countries where political power without a clearcut class character is undergoing evolution.

As the nature of state power changes and gravitates more and more noticeably towards the working classes, the public sector may become an important material prerequisite for the appearance of new relations of production in progressive African countries. And although the steps taken to expand and strengthen the public sector do not yet mean that the given society has already risen to a qualitatively new stage of social development, it would nevertheless be wrong to underestimate these changes.

In countries with a multiform socio-economic structure and a complex and motley combination of different forms of ownership in town and countryside, changes in the nature of political power entail changes in the social content and class orientation of the public sector. Progressive African countries are a good illustration.

The laws on the nationalisation of banks, insurance companies and large and medium-size industrial enterprises exerted a considerable influence on the social and economic development of the Arab Republic of Egypt. The nationalisation there of about 85 per cent of all the enterprises substantially expanded and strengthened the public sector, which included not only the basic branches of heavy industry, but light industry, transport, and foreign and domestic wholesale trade. The public sector was initially formed out of the nationalised foreign enterprises and large and medium-size Egyptian companies. Besides putting an end to the sway of foreign companies and nationalising their property, these steps dealt a heavy blow to the Egyptian bourgeoisie and undermined the positions of its middle strata.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 279.

Such steps objectively mean the expansion of the state form of ownership and, consequently, curtailment of private ownership of the means of production. This creates conditions for halting the country's development along the capitalist path and directing it on to the non-capitalist path, for it eliminates the main obstacle—imperialism's economic domination and the support given it by the local feudals and big bourgeoisie.

The March 1963 decrees in Algeria and especially the establishment on the working people's initiative of a self-management sector in agriculture, industry and trade were not only anti-imperialist and anti-feudal by their social character but anti-capitalist as well. They paved the way to the appearance and expansion of relations of production conducive to socialist society. Today, the Algerian self-management sector includes 2,500 farms and several dozen factories and mills. The implementation of progressive socio-economic reforms aggravated the class struggle in the country, which persuaded the working masses that their choice of the non-capitalist path of development was correct.

Important steps aimed at reorganising society economically and socially through the expansion of the public sector are also being taken in Guinea, Tanzania, Sudan, Libya, Somalia and other African countries. Their governments and ruling parties regard the consolidation of the public sector and economic planning as components of state policy. These countries have already laid the foundation of economic independence. One of the basic prerequisites is the establishment and expansion of the public economic sector.

The growth of the public sector helps the developing African countries to step up industrialisation, serves as a powerful means of mobilising and centralising long-term investments and allows them partially to plan their economic development with the view to giving priority to the production of means of production. Therein lies the anti-imperialist character of the economic policy and practical activity of independent African countries.

The long-term plans of economic development drawn up in many newly-free African countries set the task of laying a solid foundation of economic independence. Planning, for which the public sector creates vast possibi-

lities, exerts a definite influence on the private sector of the economy too.

But, while recognising the importance of state intervention in economic life and the need to develop the public sector, certain Western economists are seeking theoretically to prove that the role played by the state apparatus with regard to private capitalist enterprise is purely functional. American economists Theodore Geiger and Winifred Armstrong, for instance, try to impose on the newly-free African countries the idea that it is necessary to step up the development of private enterprise. Although African private economic activities are in their embryo, they say, they form a "growing part of the economies of tropical Africa".[1] Since there is a growing realisation of the significance of private enterprise in the independent countries of tropical Africa, they declare, their governments must switch to a policy of giving greater assistance to private entrepreneurs: ensure wider participation of the private sector in state planning, increase financial aid to private enterprises, etc.

It would not be wise, of course, to preclude the possibility of using—especially at the initial stage—of private capital to build up a national economy. No programme advanced by the national democratic forces, however radical they may be, provides for the complete abolition of the private sector at the present stage. The UAR Charter of National Action stresses the need to strengthen the public sector in every possible way through the nationalisation of large and medium-size industrial enterprises and the confiscation of large landed estates but at the same time points out: "The great importance attached to the role of the public sector, however, cannot do away with the existence of the private sector."[2]

The thing at the present stage is correctly to determine the correlation of the public and private sectors. In certain branches of the economy, especially in the services industry with its vast number of small entrepreneurs, it does not pay economically and politically to abolish private initiative. It is far more expedient for the state to con-

---

[1] Theodore Geiger and Winifred Armstrong, *The Development of African Private Enterprise*, Washington, 1964, p. 23.

[2] *The Charter*, Cairo, 1961, p. 57.

centrate the available resources in the key branches that exert a decisive influence on the development of the economy as a whole.

In progressive African countries one sometimes hears criticism of the economic projects which, overlooking the prevailing conditions and the economic potentialities of these countries, propose nationalisation of all private property. Behind this criticism, however, one can at times recognise far-reaching attempts fully to revive private enterprise and restore the capitalist order.

Where this problem is correctly understood, preference is given to the public sector and private capital is not allowed to develop uncontrolled, though it is given certain freedom of action, definite success has been achieved in laying the foundation of the national economy. In these countries, the public sector serves the aim of developing the economy in the interest of the nation and solving the problem of achieving economic independence and reshaping the relations of production, all this objectively creating conditions for the advanced African countries' social progress.

Much importance in the newly-free African countries' struggle for economic independence is attached to the solution of the agrarian-peasant question. And not only because agriculture plays the leading role in their economies and provides jobs to the overwhelming majority of the population. There are two extremely acute problems whose solution depends on the increase of farm production: tapping the internal resources of accumulation for their economic growth and overcoming the chronic shortage of foodstuffs. These two problems, however, are still far from solved and the reason is the low level of development of the productive forces in agriculture.

The increase in farm production in the last decade lagged behind the growth of the population in almost all African countries. As a result, huge sums are being spent to import foodstuffs. Agriculture's lag is retarding the development of the other branches of the economy and is one of the main reasons for the low standard of living.

In more than 70 per cent of the African countries farm produce accounts for more than half the exports and in 50 per cent of them for more than three-quarters, while in 20 per cent of the countries it accounts for about 90 per cent of the exports. But labour productivity in agri-

culture is very low and grows very slowly. Thus, per capita agricultural production increased by only 3 per cent from 1957 to 1965 and per capita food production actually declined.[1]

Why does agriculture in the African countries lag behind and what possible ways are there of solving this problem?

There are different points of view on this subject. Some Western economists hold that the developing African countries will never solve this problem and should give up their vain attempts. Some of the delegates attending the Fourth World Food Congress, sponsored by the UN Food and Agricultural Organisation in Copenhagen in June 1966, said the newly-free African countries should develop light industry instead of increasing the production of foodstuffs which they could import from the developed capitalist countries and for which they could pay with manufactures.

But there also exists the completely opposite viewpoint. French economist J.-M. Albertini, for instance, says: "Both for economic reasons and for social and political reasons, agriculture plays and will play a decisive role in the battle against underdevelopment."[2] The success of the general economic development of the newly-free countries will depend, in his opinion, on the effectiveness of the measures taken to modernise agriculture, measures that must include the introduction of new machines and farming methods, as well as a struggle against the social forces retarding progress. A big role in this, he says, should be assigned to agrarian reforms which should not be divorced from other development measures but go parallel with agricultural credit reforms.

In their book *Changes in Agriculture in 26 Developing Nations*, American economists believe that "most of the world's less-developed countries can sufficiently increase their food and fibre production within the next ten or twenty years to satisfy the increases in demand, and still have enough surplus to contribute substantially—through

---

[1] William A. Hance, *African Economic Development*, New York, 1967, pp. 20-21.

[2] J.-M. Albertini, *Les mécanismes du sous-développement*, Paris, 1967, p. 219.

trade and non-farm employment—to their general economic development".[1]

Among the measures which can help achieve the above-mentioned aims they list elimination of various organisational obstacles, of the governments' political instability and of the semi-feudal and tribal systems of landownership.

US bourgeois economist M. Yudelman also advocates the development of agriculture in the newly-free African countries. In his opinion, however, most of the money, including foreign aid, should be invested in agriculture instead of industry. "A very high proportion of the population must be concerned with agricultural production," he writes.[2] He is actually against the industrialisation of the developing countries, which under this scheme are still assigned the role of appendages of developed capitalist countries.

One of the basic reasons for the backwardness of agriculture is clearly inadequate allocations for its development. Although farming in these countries gives a living to 60-70 per cent of their population, the amount put into this branch of the economy comes to only 10-12 per cent of the total investments.

It would nevertheless be wrong to attribute the backwardness of agriculture merely to insufficient investments. The agrarian question, which directly affects the interests of the vast majority of the population of African countries, cannot be solved without far-going social reforms in the agrarian sphere. The agrarian question, of course, cannot be reduced to land reforms. It includes a more complex series of measures to develop productive forces in agriculture, solve the food problem, establish correct relations between various economic systems, ensure financial, technical and expert assistance to farmers, organise purchases and sales of farm products, etc. But none of these problems can be solved without far-reaching agrarian reforms.

Agrarian reforms are the basis for the solution of all

---

[1] *Changes in Agriculture in 26 Developing Nations, 1948 to 1963*, US Department of Agriculture, 1965, p. 118.

[2] *Economic Development for Africa South of the Sahara* (Proceedings of a Conference held by the International Economic Association), New York, 1964, p. 555.

other problems which have to do with the development of productive forces in agriculture and considerable improvement of the peasants' material position. The more democratic and far-reaching the reform, the more possibilities it offers for the rapid increase of agricultural production. Sometimes even very radical agrarian reforms do not yield the desired results if they are not accompanied by concrete social and economic measures.

At the same time it would be wrong to reduce the problem of reorganising agriculture merely to its technical and economic aspects, as the bourgeois economists often do. Many developing countries are aware that the agrarian problem cannot be successfully solved without radical changes in social relations in the countryside. Moreover, at the present stage of the African revolution, it is probably quite possible to set the task not only of fully abolishing pre-capitalist relationships but also that of restricting the capitalist elements.

For many African countries a very important problem is that of promoting co-operatives in the countryside which are regarded by many as a means of raising the level of agricultural production. In some countries co-operation has assumed wide proportions. But this problem is solved in its own way in each country, with due consideration of its historical and social peculiarities.

In North African countries, for instance, most of the land expropriated from big landowners was parcelled out into private ownership of commodity producers. This was done not only because there was an acute land hunger caused by the seizure of vast tracts of land by the landowners but also because there is little cultivable land there. In the United Arab Republic, for instance, between 1952 and 1964 about one million feddans (feddan = 0.42 hectare) of expropriated land were thus distributed among landless and land-poor fellaheen.[1]

In May 1966 the UAR Government took further steps against people infringing the agrarian reform law of 1961, the rich landowning families opposing progressive reforms in the countryside. The lands these feudal landowners tried to conceal from the state were confiscated and

[1] *Annuaire statistique, République Arabe Unie, 1952-1964*, Cairo, 1965, pp. 40, 43.

distributed in lots of three-four feddans among peasant families.

The struggle for the elimination of the survivals of feudalism in the Egyptian countryside made it necessary further to reduce the maximum size of estates and to revise legislation under which the peasants leased lots from landowners.

The general agricultural law approved by the UAR National Assembly on July 22, 1966, states that land can be leased only to persons engaged in farming. The steps taken to put an end to the subversive activities engaged in by feudals opposing the present regime and the defence of the interests and rights of the peasant masses are part and parcel of the programme of the country's progressive socio-economic and political development. The Charter of National Action provides for the maximum amount of land to be 100 feddans per family and not per person as it used to be, and that all land above that figure is to be expropriated.

In these conditions, nationalisation of land would meet not only with the resistance of the big feudals but with the discontent of the 3 million peasants who own small plots. It is, moreover, necessary to reckon with the centuries-long dream of the fellah to own a plot of land in which he sees some sort of guarantee against starvation.

And so co-operatives in the UAR were set up chiefly on land reclaimed from the desert, in Al-Tahrir Province, for instance. The lands made cultivable by the commissioning of the Aswan Dam will also most probably be used for co-operative farms, although the possibility that part will be given to peasants should not be precluded.

In Algeria, the so-called self-managed farms were set up mainly on estates belonging to French colonists. The land taken from the big landowners was distributed among the fellaheen. The agrarian reform took into account the fact that the liberation struggle in Algeria was closely linked with the struggle for land.

A fundamentally different situation has taken shape in tropical Africa, where there was no such thing as private ownership of land and, consequently, no feudal landownership system to be abolished. In these circumstances, fragmentation of communal land would be a step back.

The aim of the mass peasant co-operative movement is to abolish or at least restrict the system of feudal and semifeudal big landownership and the forms of exploitation it has engendered.

An important role in the development of the co-operative movement is played not only by socio-economic factors but by political ones. The biggest successes in the establishment and consolidation of co-operatives are usually achieved by the developing African countries where the peasants' urge for co-operation is encouraged and where, besides the purely economic measures, steps are taken to alter the social aspect of the countryside.

African countries have already accumulated much experience in the organisation of co-operatives. Although the co-operative movements in these countries have their peculiarities, they also have common traits. This is due first and foremost to the fact that the solution of agrarian problems is almost everywhere complicated by the backwardness of their agricultural structure. These common traits are scattered economy, prevalence of the precapitalist forms of landownership and land utilisation, employment of primitive farm implements, low yields, heavy indebtedness of the peasants and their low purchasing power, insufficient employment, illiteracy of the rural population, and so on.

In these conditions, the present system of landownership and land utilisation and the form of economic management do not and obviously cannot ensure the progressive development of farming. And although African countries have their own ways of tackling these problems, co-operation is generally considered as one of the basic conditions for raising labour productivity in agriculture and increasing farm output.

The main forms of agricultural co-operation in the newly-free African countries are credit, marketing, consumers' and producers' societies. The present-day co-operative movement is bringing about a steady increase in the co-operative contribution to over-all agricultural output. Co-operation makes it possible to overcome agricultural backwardness more quickly through wider employment of modern implements and advanced methods of management. And yet, despite the obvious advantages of the producing co-operative system, it is not being

sufficiently fast developed in the emergent countries. This is explained, on the one hand, by technical and economic reasons (lack of credits and modern farm machines, shortage of specialists, etc.) and, on the other, by the subversive activities carried on by the imperialists who exert efforts to expand and strengthen the system of private landownership in the developing countries and seek to discredit co-operation and distort its essence.

Co-operation, it is well known, is double-edged by nature: it can exist under socialism and serve the cause of socialist construction, and it can also be a motive force of the capitalist economic system. Without proper control by the state, co-operation may, even in countries that have taken the path of progressive socio-economic transformations, develop along capitalist lines and serve the interests of the better-off segment of the peasantry.

The ideologues of neo-colonialism are seeking to prove that co-operation may, even in capitalist conditions, lead to deliverance from monopoly domination, to general welfare and even to socialism. They stress that from their point of view the principle of "collectivism" does not contradict "individual landownership." And so it is not surprising that they hold up as a model the kind of co-operatives that help promote capitalist relationships in the countryside.

At the same time some authors claim that co-operation does not at all fit in with the conditions in the developing countries. This point of view, for instance, has been expressed by the authors of a two-volume survey of agricultural development in tropical Africa. "Barring a few fairly limited areas, the landownership problem in tropical Africa is engendered neither by the concentration of landed estates in the hands of a small number of individuals nor by relations between the big landowners and their tenants," they write. "It consists rather in defining the rights to land and in determining the relative importance to be attached to the rights of the individuals and the rights of the rural communities in the changing social, economic and technical conditions."[1]

As for co-operative farms, the authors say, they have

[1] *Expériences de développement agricole en Afrique tropicale*, Paris, 1967, p. 176.

not become popular because the peasants are not inclined to expand them, and most of the farms are such only nominally. These farms, they write, are "in reality capitalist enterprises that have assumed the form of co-operatives, and not that of societies with limited responsibility, to profit by certain tax privileges".[1]

The developments in some of the newly-free African countries show that there are bright prospects ahead of the producers' co-operatives. Quite a few of them have achieved good results. But there are as yet many difficulties on the path of the co-operative movement because the newly-independent countries are generally weak economically. In some places, they are engendered by the haste to accelerate the process, although the material and political conditions are not yet ripe and the peasants have not yet been convinced of the advantages of co-operation.

The experience of socialist countries shows that it takes considerable effort, time and funds to build co-operatives. The Soviet Union, for instance, was able to start widespread collectivisation only twelve years after the victory of the socialist revolution, and the process itself lasted about five years. In the European socialist countries, agricultural co-operation required fifteen to eighteen years, and in some it has not yet been consummated. The newly-free African countries naturally need not blindly emulate them in this respect, but the study of this experience would be useful, especially in order to understand how important it is to reckon with the objective conditions in tackling socio-economic problems.

What distinguishes the co-operative movement in the newly-free progressive African countries is that besides leading the broad peasant masses to the path of modernisation and progress through the producing co-operative system, they are making efforts to restrict private land-ownership, check the growth of the rural bourgeoisie, and deliver the countryside from usurers and other exploiters.

In most of the African countries the producing co-operative system is in the initial phase of its development and as yet exerts no influence on the increase of farm

[1] Ibid., p. 204.

production. It is too early to speak of its final victory even where its development is encouraged. As we have just said, this type of co-operation is just developing. The revolutionary democratic forces in the progressive African countries are using the producers' co-operatives as models to show the peasants the advantages of collective farming, to introduce new forms and methods of labour organisation in the countryside.

Everything now depends on the development of agriculture: establishment of internal sources of accumulation to finance industry, production of raw materials for industry, and improvement of welfare standards. Industrialisation, which is so very important for the young national states, also depends on the expansion of agriculture.

The newly-free African countries' industrialisation presupposes the solution of many complex problems relating to the ways and means and rate of its implementation, sources of financing, planning of the correlation of different branches of industry, economic co-operation, etc. The approach to these and other problems of industrialisation depends on the country's nature and economic potentialities. This especially applies to a large group of countries which have limited national resources and strongly depend on foreign trade.

There are different kinds of factors influencing the process of industrialisation in the developing countries. Some of them retard this process and the others facilitate it.

The following factors have an adverse effect on the rate and content of industrialisation in the newly-free African countries:

1. Backward economic structure, predetermined solely by the interests of the foreign monopolies and taking no account of the needs of the country's development.

2. Unequal position of the African countries in the international division of labour and their continuing economic dependence on the imperialist powers.

3. Restricted home market and limited export possibilities.

4. Absence of necessary internal sources of accumulation.

5. Low cultural level of the population and, consequently, shortage of local trained personnel.

At the same time there are a number of positive factors which favour a rapid industrialisation. Having won political independence, the emergent African states acquired the possibility of nationalising the property of foreign monopolies and using the profits of their enterprises to industrialise themselves. Secondly, the newly-free countries are embarking upon the path of industrialisation at the historical moment when they can rely on the all-round economic, technical and financial assistance of socialist countries.

The policy of industrialisation now pursued by some developing African countries aims at reorganising the backward colonial economic structure and building up a modern economy, at gradually turning backward colonial agrarian countries into industrial or agrarian-industrial states. The implementation of these tasks means deliverance from dependence on imperialist monopolies through far-going socio-economic reforms that would conform to the present higher level of development of the national liberation movement.

Acquisition of political independence does not deliver African countries from the economic influence of the former metropolitan countries and imperialist powers. What is even more important, it does not automatically eliminate the influence exerted on their economy by foreign monopolies. The economic policy of the newly-free African states merely lays the foundation for the achievement of economic independence.

How they will avail themselves of these possibilities depends on the character of state power and the political influence enjoyed by the progressive forces in the country. Bourgeois economists seek to prove that the economic independence the newly-free countries are striving for can be achieved only if they take the capitalist path of development. Analysing bourgeois economic writings on Africa, one clearly sees one and the same idea: to keep the newly-independent African countries within the capitalist system by any means, notably economic. American economist Harry G. Johnson, for instance, affirms in his *Economic Policies Toward Less Developed Countries* that the main way to help the backward countries in their economic development is to give them aid, which he regards as the most "convenient" and "cheap" way that will

make it possible to avoid radical, more effective ways of solving the economic development problems of the newly-independent countries. The author criticises the United States for having done so little for the developing countries.

He admits that the rapid economic development of the newly-independent countries requires internal socio-economic reforms and at the same time claims that external factors may play a decisive role in the process of their transformation. And when he seeks to determine what hampers the development of the economically backward countries, he puts the blame on nationalism which, he alleges, engenders an uncalled-for urge to substitute imports with home-made products, planning and state control of the private sector. All these, Johnson declares, "give rise to all sorts of inefficiencies and wastes of resources"[1] and upset the mechanism of free competition, and that undermines the competitive power of the local entrepreneurs and means neglect of agricultural development and sacrifice of the interests of agriculture to the interests of industrial development.

There are two erroneous theses sometimes advanced concerning the achievement of economic independence. First, there is a simplified view that to achieve economic independence it is enough to sever economic ties with the outer world and, relying on one's own resources, eliminate economic backwardness. Such claims very often betray nationalistic ambitions which take little account of economic realities.

Secondly, there is a view that the decisive role in the building of the national economy and, consequently, in the achievement of economic independence is to be played by foreign aid. As a result of the unrealistic appraisal of foreign economic aid, the shortcomings and errors in economic policy and the slow rate of growth of the productive forces are blamed in some countries on external and not internal factors.

Nevertheless, despite all their efforts, the imperialist powers and their ideologues are unable to hamper the persevering efforts of the newly-free countries to achieve

---

[1] Harry G. Johnson, *Economic Policies Toward Less Developed Countries*, Washington, 1968, p. 69.

economic independence, notably their efforts to push on with industrialisation, which has become one of the vital demands of the masses' political movement. And so the imperialists try to alter the social trend of the policy of industrialisation, get the emergent countries to build the infrastructure and develop light industry, retard the rate of industrialisation, etc.

To believe certain bourgeois economists, the urge of the newly-free African states to build certain branches of industry is merely a manifestation of economic nationalism, an "ostentation", a thing not prompted by economic needs.

Of late, however, one hears more and more voices in support of the developing countries' industrialisation. French economist J.-M. Albertini, for instance, regards industrialisation as an inevitable element of these countries' efforts to eliminate their economic backwardness. He is against their concentration on the development of light industry and handicrafts, believing it more correct to build large industrial units. At the same time he urges the newly-free African countries to build enterprises of optimum size, to see to it that they are economically efficient, and advises them not to build heavy industry without appropriate agreements with their neighbours. As far as the financing of industrialisation is concerned, he proposes that it should be done chiefly at the expense of the urban sector, by taxing city dwellers, and not at the expense of agriculture.[1]

Industrialisation in the developing African countries has a number of important distinctive traits. One of them is that it is a conglomerate of two methods of industrialisation or two social types of industry. Industrialisation on the basis of the development of the public sector with the introduction of elements of economic planning and fairly substantial restriction of private enterprise has traits in common with socialist industrialisation. But there are still powerful trends in these countries to industrialise themselves by capitalist methods—by strengthening private ownership of the means of production, expanding market relations, enlisting the aid of foreign capital, etc.

---

[1] J.-M. Albertini, *Les mécanismes du sous-développement*, pp. 235, 248.

However, these springs of capitalist industrialisation do not function effectively in the newly-free African countries. It is well known that the imperialist states built their heavy industry to a large extent by plundering the colonies. In the developed capitalist countries, industrialisation was usually accompanied by the ruin of small producers, by their pauperisation, by the accumulation of enormous wealth by a handful of capitalists. The possibilities for the accumulation of funds in private hands and the development of large-scale private industry through the reduction of consumption, low as it is, are in fact very limited in the newly-free countries.

One feature common to most of the developing African countries is the existence and struggle of the two above-mentioned methods of industrialisation. At the present stage of development of the African countries it is possible simultaneously to employ the two forms of industrial production (public and private) and the two methods of industrialisation. The need to use them is predetermined by the objective conditions prevailing in these countries, by their potentialities.

The policy of industrialisation, the aim of which is to accelerate industrial development in every way, should not ignore the danger of going too fast and leaping over certain stages of economic development. Moreover, it is very important to analyse the economic state of the given country and to strive for the kind of development that would reflect the continuity of the economic process.

In practice, this does not only mean rationally to utilise all the national resources but also to work out a rational approach to the traditional branches of production, notably arts and crafts, etc. Since the level of industrial development is low in most of the African countries, a large part of the goods consumed at home is produced by artisans. This industry with centuries-old traditions gives employment to a considerable segment of the able-bodied population that find no application for their labour in other industries.

The proportion of handicraft production is still quite big even in the economically more developed countries. In the ARE, for instance, 46,000 of the 134,000 enterprises are handicraft workshops employing no hired labour,

40,000 employ one person, and over 36,000 employ from two to four persons. Especially developed are the textile, tanning, ceramics, woodworking and metalware handicraft industries.

Some African countries have latterly undertaken attempts to co-operate artisans and thus better to organise their labour and raise productivity. To this end the state grants credits to artisans, supplies them with raw materials and takes care of the sale of their products. The process of co-operation is only in its initial phase.

The attitude to the traditional types of production is closely linked with the question of the selection of the correct "mix" of small, medium and large enterprises, with their economic efficiency. *The Challenge of Development*, a symposium dealing mostly with the practical question of economic development in the newly-free countries, rightly says that the choice of the optimum combination of large, medium and small units in each branch is one of the most important problems of industrialisation.

In his article in this symposium, American economist Eugene Staley, for instance, correctly points out that the development plans in almost all the developing countries do not provide for the modernisation and further increase of the number of medium and small enterprises which, in his opinion, better accord with the needs of the backward countries because they respond more quickly to market demands and their activity helps oust foreign capital from certain branches of industry. But one can hardly agree with the author when he tries to prove that the emergent states have no need to build large modern industrial units because they are always unprofitable.[1]

And in their *Modern Small Industry for Developing Countries* Eugene Staley and Richard Morse affirm that "underestimation of the potential contribution of small manufacturing units may come from the glamour which surrounds large undertakings, from exaggerated notions about the scope and size of scale economies in manufacturing, from failure to recognise certain offsetting factors to scale economies, and from the greater convenience to planners of thinking in terms of a few large units instead

---

[1] *The Challenge of Development. Theory and Practice*, Chicago, 1967, pp. 302-09.

of hundreds of small units".[1] But the problem is much more complicated, of course.

The question of building heavy industry in the newly-free African countries is solved in different ways. This is not due only to the fact that these countries differ substantially from one another in the level of their industrial development. While some have a relatively developed manufacturing industry, many are still going through the "pre-industrial" period. Industrialisation also depends on the size of the country, its natural conditions, resources and a number of other factors.

In the first group, industrialisation has become the immediate task of economic policy (the ARE, for instance). The Arab Republic of Egypt is already developing the iron and steel, fuel, chemical and other industries, including engineering, which is the core of industrialisation. In one of his speeches in 1965, the late President Gamal Abdel Nasser stressed that one could clearly see two basic moments in the country's economic policy. In the first phase of its industrialisation, Egypt had built light industry enterprises, enterprises to manufacture consumer goods, and in the second, attention would be concentrated on the building of heavy industry enterprises.

For the second group of countries the establishment of heavy industry is a thing of the future. They are just working on industrialisation plans which will take two or three decades to fulfil. The process of industrialisation is subdivided into periods. The first, which will probably last at least ten years, provides for the establishment and prior development of light industry. Another task in this period is to organise the production of building materials, such as cement, glass, bricks, certain kinds of metal structures, etc. It is also planned gradually to alter the structure of export trade so that a considerable part of raw materials is processed on the spot. At present, the bulk of farm products and minerals is exported as raw materials without going through even primary processing. The amount of metal ores processed in the country is insignificant. This applies especially to nonferrous metals.

In the second phase of industrialisation it is planned

[1] Eugene Staley and Richard Morse, *Modern Small Industry for Developing Countries*, New York, 1965, p. 229.

to organise the production of ferrous and nonferrous metals, chemicals, fertilisers, synthetic goods, etc., and to lay the foundation of machine-building.

French economist Jean Louis Lacroix, who had for years taught and conducted research at Lovanium University in Kinshasa and who generally advocates the prior development of the industries producing consumer goods, believes the Congo has reached the level of industrial production at which it may proceed with the second stage of industrialisation, i.e., to start developing the industry manufacturing means of production. Among other things, he considers it possible to build two industrial units—chemical, and iron and steel works—in the Kinshasa area. Their construction, in his opinion, will entail the development of other branches which will turn the Congo into an industrially developed country. The author draws attention to the fact that these projects will cost relatively little to build—11,500 million Congolese francs—and recalls that at the end of the 1950s annual investments in that country ranged between 14,000 and 16,000 million Congolese francs.[1] The Katanga area, which is extremely rich in minerals, should be used chiefly to satisfy domestic requirements, he says. Lastly, he proposes to create a third industrial area around Stanleyville.

As for the third group of countries, there is practically no question now of their building heavy industry. In their case, the problem of industrialisation can obviously be solved only through the development of regional economic ties. The solution of this problem will probably depend to a large extent on inner-regional and inter-regional cooperation. These are mainly small countries for which cooperation is in fact the only way to expand the domestic market.

Economic integration, whose role is growing everywhere along with the need to specialise in production, is especially important for little countries with limited national resources in which there can be no question of building an all-embracing industry. Economic integration gives the developing countries a number of important

---

[1] Jean Louis Lacroix, *Industrialisation au Congo*, Paris, 1967, p. 145.

advantages. First and foremost, it unites narrow national markets into a common market capable of absorbing the products of the branches of industry which the member-country is developing.

By present-day standards, iron and steel works with a capacity of 500,000 tons a year are considered small. Yet one such works can now meet the requirements in ferrous metals of all West African countries. A big common market is also necessary because the developing African countries now practically cannot find a market for their industrial goods in the economically developed countries. Moreover, their weak position in the world market, due to their economic backwardness, leads to the deterioration of the terms on which they trade with other countries and, consequently, to greater financial losses, which naturally tell on the growth of the national economy. And so it is in the interest of the newly-free African countries to fight together for the kind of principles of world trade that would put an end to their being exploited with the aid of the mechanism of world prices. The most effective means would be the economic integration first of a few countries and then on a bigger scale.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the inner-regional co-ordination of industrial development not only helps to extend the scale of production but also offers the most rational way for developing industry because it makes it possible to economise on funds and material resources.

Even initial experience shows that the economic integration of African countries, being an objectively necessary process, is at the same time a prerequisite of their industrialisation. Only by uniting their national economies can these countries build a sufficiently big market for the products of their industries, make better use of their resources and the advantages of the international division of labour, and strengthen their position in the world market.

But there are many difficulties to be overcome, and not only economic ones. Political factors often turn out to be decisive. Economic integration, establishment of a single market and other forms of inner-regional economic co-operation can become an industrialisation-accelerating factor only if there are national forces in the developing

countries who understand such integration and are capable of effecting it.

One serious obstacle to the economic integration of the newly-free countries is their extreme dependence on the imperialist powers. The result of this dependence is the establishment of diverse administrative systems and legislations which have given rise to considerable differences in the structure of the state and economic apparatus. Africa is divided into several currency zones. Eighteen African countries have become associate members of the European Economic Community (Common Market), while the former British colonies are economically associated with the Commonwealth. They have different customs, regimes and produce different goods, this depending on what they have inherited from the metropolitan countries.

The developing countries have latterly become increasingly convinced that the process of economic integration has to be consciously regulated. This finds expression in the establishment of regional banks, planning and development research institutes, etc.

Industrialisation has yet another important aspect: the use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, notably modern machinery. One of the distinctive features of the industrialisation of the developing countries is that it is being effected at a different technical level of development of the productive forces from that in the 19th century, when this process was going on in the West European countries and the United States.

The century separating the industrialisation of the developing countries from an analogical process in Western Europe has witnessed radical changes in foreign economic conditions. The developing countries are building up their industries at a time when a considerably better developed industry, with higher technology and productivity and higher-quality produce, already exists in other continents. International economic ties have expanded sharply in this period too. While the developed capitalist countries relied chiefly on their own machine-building enterprises during their industrialisation, the developing African countries strongly depend in their industrialisation on imported equipment and means of production.

The need to acquire means of production and hire technical specialists abroad turns the question of indus-

trialisation from the very start into a question of international relations and international politics. The former colonies' and semi-colonies' close economic ties with the imperialist powers and the role they played for years as purveyors of raw materials and markets for the industrial goods to the leading capitalist countries have brought about a state in which the industrialisation policy of the developing countries affects the entire system of world economic ties and evokes a reaction from developed capitalist countries.

The development of production at the present level of technology requires not only big capital outlays but highly-qualified specialists. For the time being, the newly-independent African countries have neither enough capital nor specialists. This gives the opponents of their industrialisation a pretext to refuse to supply them with up-to-date industrial equipment and machinery. They want these countries, if only at the beginning, to use outdated machinery, for which there is little demand in the markets of the developed capitalist countries. The imperialist powers, being no longer able to prevent the industrialisation of the emergent countries, thus hope to slow down the process.

The principle of economic inequality prevailing in the world capitalist market has assumed new forms. The former colonies' dependence, as suppliers of raw materials, on the economic requirements of the industrially developed imperialist powers has turned into their dependence on these powers as producers of technically imperfect industrial goods. Just as whole branches of industry, as well as small and medium enterprises, are subordinated to the leading branches in the process of the technological revolution in the imperialist countries, so are the technically weaker countries—i.e., the developing countries—subordinated to the countries with a higher technical level—i.e., the imperialist powers.

The imperialist powers assign the developing African countries the role of "world village" in the capitalist system, of an "auxiliary function" in the process of capitalist reproduction.

The developing countries' imperialist-styled industrialisation, undertaken with the aid of imported outdated industrial equipment, thus causes no loss to the imperialist

powers. On the contrary, they profit by it, for it enables them to renovate their fixed assets at the expense of the developing countries. Nor does such industrialisation help the latter overcome their economic backwardness, because it does not eliminate the gap between them and the industrially developed capitalist countries.

It is well realised in many newly-free democratic African countries that industrialisation in the conditions of limited economic possibilities requires the wide and active support of the masses, their participation in economic management, the establishment of state control over the country's economic resources and foreign trade.

Expansion and consolidation of the public sector and promotion of economic ties with socialist countries are the factors that enable the newly-independent African countries to achieve economic independence.

KEY PROBLEM OF NEWLY-INDEPENDENT AFRICAN STATES

The independent African states play an important part in the present-day world. Although they have not completely broken out of the grip of the world capitalist economy, many of them are no longer part of the political system of imperialism. The objective reason for their anti-imperialist foreign policy is often the anti-capitalist sentiment of the masses that have freed themselves from colonial dependence.

The nature of the struggle for social emancipation and social progress is exceptionally complex and contradictory. This struggle of profound social and political significance directly affects the interests of all classes and social groups, and is very closely bound up with the vital problem of the newly-free African states' development. Their choice of path is very important, for not only their own well-being but the alignment of forces in the international arena depends on it. That is why this problem is vitally important for the newly-free countries. Today, it is the main trend and the main content of the class struggle in the developing African countries.

The solution of this problem will depend first and foremost on internal conditions, on how the situation shapes out in each given country, on the alignment of the class forces and the development of the class struggle. The foreign policy aspect of this problem, however, should not be ignored. A considerable influence on the development of the African countries is being and will be exerted by the general international situation, particularly by the outcome of the competition between the two world social systems. Africa's future depends to a large extent on which of these two systems—socialism or capitalism—will exert the decisive influence on its socio-economic and political development.

Knowing how important Africa is in this respect, the imperialist powers, notably the United States, resort to every possible means and method, including brute pres-

sure and armed aggression, to force it to take the capitalist path of development.

But the situation in the African countries is changing, the influence of the progressive forces standing for non-capitalist development is growing. What distinguishes the newly-free African countries is that they are embarking on the path of independent development at a time when capitalism has outlived itself as a social system. It is not in a position to ensure their economic growth. The hopes of "rejuvenating" capitalism at the expense of the African countries have no real foundation because capitalism is being established and developed there in the conditions of imperialist monopoly domination, a situation created by the economic exploitation of the young national states.

There is nevertheless a real possibility for the newly-free African countries to choose the non-capitalist path of development. As the Central Committee's report to the 24th CPSU Congress, delivered by General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, stressed, "today, there are already quite a few countries in Asia and Africa which have taken the non-capitalist way of development, that is, the path of building a socialist society in the long term".[1]

The idea that it was possible for the backward countries to take the socialist path without going through the capitalist stage was first advanced by the founders of scientific communism, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. They said it was quite conceivable that after the abolition of capitalism in the industrially developed countries, the economically and socially backward countries would take a short-cut in their development, i.e., by-pass the capitalist stage. In his letter to Karl Kautsky of September 12, 1882, Engels wrote: "Once Europe is reorganised, and North America, that will furnish such colossal power and such an example that the semi-civilised countries will of themselves follow in their wake; economic needs, if anything, will see to that. But as to what social and political phases these countries will then have to pass through before they likewise arrive at socialist organisation, I think we today can advance only rather idle hypotheses."[2] The founders

[1] *Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 23.

[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 481.

of scientific communism linked the possibility of bypassing "all the fatal visissitudes of the capitalist regime"[1] with the victory of the socialist revolution in the developed capitalist countries, when the victorious proletariat would give the backward countries the necessary material, organisational and other assistance, for by itself a backward country cannot avoid the capitalist stage, "can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development."[2]

In the days when Marx and Engels lived, the problem of non-capitalist development was largely a theoretical one. There was no practical experience to prove it really possible to "leap over" the capitalist phase of social development or practically corroborate this important Marxist theoretical conclusion. Moreover, the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries was then in its embryo.

Practically, it was only after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution that this problem arose before the international communist and working-class movement. In the new historical situation which had taken shape, Lenin amplified and thoroughly substantiated the idea of the non-capitalist path, bearing in mind the experience acquired in the process of the non-capitalist development of some of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic.

At the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920, Lenin thus formulated this problem: "Are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war? We replied in the negative."[3]

The theoretical elaboration of this problem combined with the all-round generalisation of the initial practical experience gained in the process of the non-capitalist development of the peoples of certain outskirts of the former Russian Empire and of the Mongolian People's Re-

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, 1969, p. 378.
[2] K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, 1965, p. 10.
[3] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

public. In analysing the problem of non-capitalist development, Marxists-Leninists bear in mind the following factors:

1. The economic backwardness of the newly-free African countries and the low level of development of social relations in these countries.

2. The existence of fundamental differences between the national liberation and socialist revolutions.

3. The existence of the world socialist system and its growing influence on the world revolutionary process.

Marxists-Leninists have never claimed that the economically backward countries are doomed to wait passively for the material prerequisites of socialism to mature. They have always rejected such a concept as invalid. It is well known how resolutely Lenin opposed those who advocated a wait-and-see policy, i.e., to wait until capitalism had taken deep root in the colonies and semi-colonies.

Today, when capitalism is living itself out as a social system, when mankind is in the midst of transition from capitalism to socialism, it would be strange to hope that the socio-economic progress of the backward countries can be promoted by capitalist methods. The successes of the world socialist system as well as the results of their own progressive reforms are convincing the African peoples that they can radically improve their living conditions and accelerate economic and social progress only by taking the path to socialism. The broad urban and rural masses in the independent African countries gauge capitalism by their own recent colonial past. In their minds, there is no difference between colonial oppression and capitalism. Capitalism for them is not the path leading to the ultimate and rapid elimination of their century-old backwardness, to national regeneration and social progress. That is why these nations reject capitalism and favour the socialist path of development.

The possibility of non-capitalist development is inherent in the very nature of the national liberation revolutions which do not separate themselves from socialist revolutions by a "Chinese Wall". Being bourgeois democratic by nature and opposed to feudalism and imperialism, the national liberation revolution in Africa is to a certain extent opposed to capitalism too. This makes it possible

to regard the African revolution as one which may gradually assume some of the traits of the socialist revolution.

It would be wrong, however, to mix up these two types of revolutions, for there are fundamental differences between them too. They are due first and foremost to the various levels of the stages of their social and historical development. One of the differences is that the implementation of socialist transformations is not the immediate aim of the national liberation revolution. The latter does not approach this aim immediately but after a certain historical period of transition in the course of which socio-economic and political factors become mature. This period in the historical development of the progressive developing countries is called a period of non-capitalist development.

What mainly distinguishes this period is that the socio-economic and political processes designed to pave the way to socialist development for the newly-free progressive countries are directed by non-proletarian strata. A socialist revolution is carried out after the formation of the proletariat—when it has come to recognise itself as a class and turned into a force capable of assuming leadership of the revolutionary movement of all the toiling and exploited masses, when it has its own political party with a clear idea about the aim of the struggle and is armed with a scientifically substantiated programme for building a new society.

So far these decisive political factors are non-existent in most of the newly-independent countries. Even in the progressive developing African countries the socio-economic and political conditions essential for the next stage of the socialist reorganisation of society are still only in the process of ripening.

Therefore, one should not confuse the two different stages in the progressive development of the newly-free African countries and, consequently, the concepts "non-capitalist path" and "socialist development." It is equally dangerous to underestimate the elements of socialism arising in the period of development of the progressive newly-free African countries and to overestimate the positions of socialism in these countries, for it may create the erroneous impression that they have chosen the path of development once and for all.

The non-capitalist path, as a historically possible stage

in the development of countries with a multistructural socio-economic system and undeveloped social relations, presupposes above all the development and a more clear-cut differentiation of the social-class forces and their gradual regrouping, in the process of which the direction of the socio-economic and political processes is taken over by the classes and political forces capable of leading these countries in their transition to socialism. This means above all the consolidation of the position of the working class, the strengthening of its alliance with the peasantry, the evolution of the political and ideological views of the progressive non-proletarian elements and their gradual acceptance of the ideas of scientific socialism. It would be wrong, for instance, to try to "compensate" the absence of a modern organised working class in many African countries with the revolutionism of the non-proletarian elements, claiming that the development of the national liberation revolution into a socialist revolution is already on their agenda.

In present-day Africa the forces favouring non-capitalist development are represented chiefly by the revolutionary democratic parties which are in power in a number of countries. They include the Arab Socialist Union in the ARE, the National Liberation Front in Algeria, the Democratic Party of Guinea, and the Tanganyika African National Union. Some of these parties were set up before their countries achieved political independence and their advent to power was a natural result of the long years of struggle under their direct leadership. This applies, for instance, to Guinea and Tanzania. Others came into existence during the national liberation revolution, when the logic of the class struggle and practical activity in the implementation of the initial socio-economic reforms made it objectively necessary to set up a political party as a guiding force in the building of a new society. Such was the process in the ARE. Lastly, the leadership of some parties was taken over by the progressive forces as a result of the revolutionary developments and the masses' struggle, and their political orientation underwent sharp changes.

Each revolutionary democratic party naturally has its own peculiarities, predetermined by the national and social conditions obtaining in the given country. But they also

have certain common traits that make it possible to regard them as a unique and new phenomenon that requires a careful study. One of them is the definite similarity of their social-class composition, political line and ideologies. These are generally mass parties with a very varied social composition. They in fact include all the patriotic forces in the country, from the peasants—their main social force—to the progressive representatives of the national bourgeoisie.

Revolutionary democracy in the African countries is developing at a time when the ideas of socialism are winning the hearts of the broad masses. The establishment of the ideological platform and political line of the revolutionary democratic forces is influenced, on the one hand, by the vast successes of the world socialist system and, on the other, by the internal forms of the African countries' development. This is also reflected in the ideological conceptions of the revolutionary democrats when the ideas they get from the arsenal of scientific socialism go side by side with bourgeois nationalistic views. Hence the possibility of there being two ways for the development of revolutionary democracy: either gradual adherence to scientific socialism or renunciation of the originally proclaimed socialist slogans and adoption of the path of bourgeois nationalism.

Which of these two tendencies will prevail depends on many factors, including whether or not it will be possible to establish a close alliance and correct relations between the revolutionary democratic parties and all the progressive revolutionary forces, including the Marxists-Leninists, the most staunch and irreconcilable opponents of national and social oppression. The quicker the working class forms and the more its political and ideological influence grows, the more successful this process will be.

In characterising present-day African revolutionary democracy, some by way of analogy refer to the political activity of Dr. Sun Yat-sen as a typical representative of revolutionary democracy in the East. Such a historical parallel is quite justified, for the day when this Chinese revolutionary lived is not far removed from our time, and the conditions are very much the same. Lenin, it may be recalled, said Dr. Sun was a revolutionary democrat, adding that he was a representative of "revolutionary bour-

geois democracy",[1] for "the *essence* of Sun Yat-sen's Narodism, of his progressive, militant, revolutionary programme for bourgeois-democratic agrarian reform, and of his quasi-socialist theory"[2] consisted in his following "*a purely capitalist*, a maximum capitalist, agrarian programme".[3]

Lenin's view of the prospects of the Chinese revolution is absolutely justified and understandable, for it was a matter of "revolutionary bourgeois democracy". As the number of Shanghais—"i.e., huge centres of capitalist wealth and proletarian need and poverty"[4]—increases, he wrote, the Chinese proletariat will increase. "It will probably form some kind of Chinese Social Democratic labour party which, while criticising the petty-bourgeois utopias and reactionary views of Sun Yat-sen, will certainly take care to single out, defend and develop the revolutionary-democratic core of his political and agrarian programme."[5]

And so if the present revolutionary democrats in the African countries were to be compared to the Chinese democrats, it would be logical to assess their policy as bourgeois or petty bourgeois. But this is not always done because it is recognised that revolutionary democrats are capable of carrying out a revolutionary programme that leads to socialism and not capitalism. And if it is so, the given historical analogy is hardly justified.

We may also recall Russian 19th century revolutionary democracy, personified by such outstanding figures as Alexander Herzen, Vissarion Belinsky, Nikolai Chernyshevsky and Nikolai Dobrolyubov. Perhaps the present-day revolutionary democrats of the East are closer to them in their convictions than to Sun Yat-sen? Such a comparison is very risky, for these two phenomena are separated by almost a century, and the very nature of the epoch has changed radically in this period. And these changes have had a decisive effect on all social processes and social phenomena.

What is the main criterion in characterising present-day revolutionary democrats? If one approaches this question

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 166.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., p. 167.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid., p. 169.

formally, one will easily see that they have many traits in common with their predecessors. The social basis of the Russian revolutionary democrats and Sun Yat-sen and the present-day revolutionary democrats in Africa is the same—the peasantry. They are all champions of the revolutionary democratism of the peasant masses. But this apparent identity, this resemblance, is purely external, for it does not reflect the essence of the phenomenon.

In assessing revolutionary democracy, it is necessary, in our opinion, to take above all into account its relations with scientific socialism. If we take this as a criterion, we shall find that there is quite a difference between Russian revolutionary democracy and the Chinese democracy personified by Sun Yat-sen and the modern revolutionary democracy of the African countries.

Lenin said the Russian revolutionary democrats were the precursors of Russian social democracy. Here is what he wrote: "For about half a century—approximately from the forties to the nineties of the last century—progressive thought in Russia, oppressed by a most brutal and reactionary tsarism, sought eagerly for a correct revolutionary theory, and followed with the utmost diligence and thoroughness each and every 'last word' in this sphere in Europe and America. Russia achieved Marxism—the only correct revolutionary theory—through the *agony* she experienced in the course of half a century of unparalleled torment and sacrifice, of unparalleled revolutionary heroism, incredible energy, devoted searching, study, practical trial, disappointment, verification, and comparison with European experience."[1] An outstanding part in the elaboration of such a revolutionary theory was played by the Russian revolutionary democrats.

But Sun Yat-sen and other revolutionary bourgeois democrats were far from recognising scientific socialism. It is not fortuitous that Lenin foresaw the imperative need in China to set up a social democratic party as a spokesman and champion of the ideas of scientific socialism.

Revolutionary democracy's attitude to scientific socialism and proper relations between them are one of the most important problems before the African national liber-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 25-26.

ation movement. Developments in a number of countries show that the absence of such relations and the possible aggravation of struggle between the revolutionary democrats and the revolutionary proponents of scientific socialism benefit only imperialism and the local reactionary forces. It is not for nothing that the imperialists and their placemen seek to exacerbate this struggle, to split the revolutionary forces. The ideologues of imperialism and neocolonialism try to convince the African peoples that the ideas of scientific socialism are inapplicable to Africa, that this continent needs its own, "purely African" theory.

The proponents of scientific socialism naturally cannot ignore the unique, specific traits of the African countries. They realise that the peoples of this vast continent who have just smashed the chains of colonial slavery are going through the complex process of forming ideologically, and that this process is by far not over. The situation there is highly fluid, there has as yet been no clear-cut polarisation of the class forces and a great many groups and elements have not chosen their political and ideological credo, and so it is especially important to display a creative approach to the realities, to the determination of the ways and means of developing the African revolution, to the elaboration of its strategy and tactics.

In their struggle for the independent African states' progressive development, the revolutionary and democratic forces come into bitter conflict with the ideological conceptions and practical policies of the bourgeois elements striving for the capitalist kind of development. If one is to judge of the bourgeois parties in some African countries not by their names but by their policies and ideology, one will see that many of them, like the national bourgeoisie in general, have in recent years been shifting Right. This increasingly clear evolution is evidenced, for instance, by their noticeable deviation from the earlier proclaimed general democratic principles, the weakening of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial front, the spread and strengthening of capitalist relations, the intensification of repressive measures against the revolutionary forces, and the efforts to check the development of national liberation revolutions.

It is a well-known fact that in some African countries bourgeois parties won the masses over and assumed the

leadership of the anti-imperialist national liberation movement with the aid of democratic slogans. Once in power, however, the leaders of these parties were in no hurry to keep their promises. The reforms decided upon in the early years of independence hardly affected the socio-economic foundations of society and in fact led to capitalist development. All they did was slightly to modernise some social institutions, adapting them to the needs of the fast-growing local bourgeoisie.

It became increasingly obvious that the policy of these parties was directed towards the development of a bourgeois society generally patterned on the former colonial powers. It is only natural, therefore, that there is a growing discontent in many African countries with this policy of the bourgeois parties.

A bitter struggle around the choice of the path of development also flared up in some of the ruling parties which cannot be classified outright as bourgeois. As a rule, they are highly motley in composition, uniting numerous and highly heterogeneous strata. The differentiation of forces in these parties is a rather intensive process and often leads to open splits. This happened in Kenya, for instance, when the ruling Kenya African National Union split and the fairly large group that withdrew from it founded a new party which came to be known as the Kenya People's Union.

Some hold that the splits in the ruling parties in some African countries were due to tribal disunity and racial differences. British Professor John P. Mackintosh says in his *Nigerian Government and Politics* that "the conventions or rules on which the operation of Western democratic forms depend have no roots in Nigerian experience or social conditions".[1] People there put their duties to their relatives above their duties to the country, he says, and tribal links are so far stronger than the class links.

One must not ignore, of course, the viability of tribal and racial relations, which often prevail over class affiliation, especially in the conditions of undeveloped social-class structure. Some African countries still have political parties formed of members of one tribe.

---

[1] John P. Mackintosh, *Nigerian Government and Politics*, London, 1966, p. 617.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to underestimate the social factor. Actually, every differentiation of political forces, which sometimes outwardly looks like a consequence of racial and tribal differences, is motivated to some extent by social-class considerations. This differentiation reflects in one way or another the clash of two tendencies—bourgeois and non-capitalist. As for Kenya, the authors who attribute the split in the ruling party to the growing "natural antagonisms of the poor for the rich"[1] are probably right.

The Kenyan bourgeoisie, so far a numerically small class formed by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, invests capital in real estate and has in many ways adopted the European settlers' way of life. The government encourages this tendency. According to Richard Cox, after the June 1963 elections no less than 102 out of the National Assembly's members obtained credit from a finance house for new cars.[2] Although small in size, this social stratum obviously plays the leading role in the Kenya African National Union and exerts a strong influence on the party's and the country's policies.

Analogical processes—the bourgeoisification of the ruling parties—are to be observed in certain other African countries. The leadership of the Democratic Party of the Ivory Coast is being criticised increasingly for its conservatism and orientation on capitalist farmers.[3] There is more or less similar criticism of the ruling political parties in certain other African countries.

Analysing this development, linked with the formation of a new social stratum and its influence on the newly-independent countries, Western bourgeois authors seek to represent it all as a conflict between the nascent elite which champions new ideas and values and the old elite consisting of tribal chiefs and local officials who were appointed to their posts back in the colonial days. The authors of *The New Elites of Tropical Africa,* for instance, affirm that "the analysis of conflict between the elites is a most necessary element in the study of political processes in

---

[1] Richard Cox, *Kenyatta's Country*, London, 1965, p. 158.
[2] Ibid., p. 154.
[3] Dorothy Dodge, *African Politics in Perspective*, Princeton, N.Y., Toronto, New York, London, 1966, p. 88.

the new African states."[1] In the opinion of one bourgeois author, an African leader's position depends not on his class status but on "the atmosphere and thinking which reigned in the organisation to which he belonged, the kind of European with whom he had been in contact, the kind of family which had received him into their homes—or did not want to receive him into their homes".[2]

By their social-class nature, the political parties in power in most of the African countries can probably be classified as petty-bourgeois parties with a predominantly peasant membership. There are two possible ways for their development. As their bourgeois members grow in number and strength and extend their influence, these parties may gradually turn into bourgeois parties speaking for the nascent African bourgeoisie and pursuing a pro-capitalist and even pro-imperialist policy. But, then, it is also possible that the national democratic and revolutionary forces in these parties will prevent the further growth of the capitalist elements, considerably restrict the sphere of their political activity and strengthen the non-capitalist and socialist trends in these parties. And although, as practice shows, the bourgeoisie, or the pro-capitalist trend, often takes the upper hand, the second possibility should not be underestimated. In the final count everything will be decided by the struggle around the choice of path which will probably grow in scope and sharpness along with the differentiation of the social-class forces.

A big role in the struggle for the non-capitalist path of development is played by the state which must take into account the specific social conditions in the newly-free countries. What are they?

First, the overwhelming majority of the population in the newly-free African countries are peasants and urban middle strata whose interests and influence directly affect the nature of the state and its policies.

Secondly, the contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and imperialism remain sharp, and this creates objective conditions for the loyal bourgeois elements to take part in the united anti-imperialist front not only

[1] *The New Elites of Tropical Africa*. London, 1966, p. 380.

[2] Tom Kerstiens, *The New Elite in Asia and Africa. A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Ghana*, New York, Washington, London, 1966, p. 186.

during the struggle for political independence but also in the period of socio-economic transformations.

Thirdly, the formation of the proletariat proceeds faster than the development of the national bourgeoisie. The struggle of the working class is chiefly directed against the foreign monopolies holding strong positions in the economy of the emergent African countries.

Fourthly, during the African peoples' struggle for liberation an important role in uniting the patriotic forces is played by the national factor. The colonialists long trampled upon their national feelings and traditions and tried to deprive them of their individuality and impose an alien way of thinking upon them. That is why many socio-economic demands and programmes of social progress have a heavy national flavour.

The all-round consideration of the specific traits of the new African states and the correct combination of national and social tasks are one of the most important functions of the progressive national democratic state following the non-capitalist path of development. Such a state is not a one-class dictatorship. It tries to promote the co-operation of progressive social classes and groups—the peasants, the working class, the national bourgeoisie, the middle strata and the intellectuals. The bloc of these classes and social forces makes up the political foundation of such a state.

This does not mean, however, that in this instance the state acts as an instrument of reconciliation between classes and class antagonisms. As the state-building experience already accumulated in independent African countries shows, a state comes into existence not only where class contradictions objectively cannot be reconciled but also where these contradictions have not yet grown into sharp antagonisms. Class differentiation usually takes place there after the establishment of an independent national state which can, in a number of cases, be relatively independent of the classes. In this connection it will be appropriate to recall that Engels wrote that "by way of exception, however, periods occur in which the warring classes balance each other so nearly that the state power, as ostensible mediator, acquires, for the moment, a certain degree of independence of both."[1]

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 328.

This thesis obviously applies not only to societies with a developed class structure but also to countries where class differentiation is not yet sufficiently clear-cut and where the balance of forces is the result of inadequately developed class struggle.

In these concrete conditions the state is a factor capable of speeding up socio-economic progress. For in African countries, where capitalism is underdeveloped and the sources of accumulation are very limited, production according with the present-day level in science and technology can be organised only within the public sector, and only thus can their economic and social progress be ensured. The socio-economic structure in existence in many African countries today took shape in unique historical and social conditions, when capitalist relations were overburdened with feudal and prefeudal forms of ownership and, consequently, had no scope for their development.

The main spheres of private capital investment in Africa were the mining industry, agriculture, trade and the service industry. But even there the foreign monopolies held back the development of national African capital in every possible way. In most of the African countries the basis of the economy is still small-scale commodity production. These are economically backward countries that have not reached even the average level of capitalist development.

While the alliance of all the progressive social classes and groups of population is the political backbone of the national democratic state in the period of its non-capitalist development, the public sector is its economic foundation. Only with the aid of the public sector, which is based on a higher and more progressive form of ownership than the private, can such a state actively oppose foreign capital and enlist the participation of the working masses in the administration of the country. Despite all its complexity and its inconsistent development in the new African countries, the public sector may turn into the material factor of their switch to the non-capitalist path which eventually leads to socialism. The underdevelopment of national capitalism in Africa has affected the character of the national liberation movement, its demands, its composition, the forms and rates of social development. It is on the level of development of capitalism that the scope and scale of the national liberation movement depends. As

a result of the colonial peoples' constant and diverse contacts with the economic system of the imperialist powers, the formation of their political and ideological views was often ahead of the development of the scale and nature of social demands which directly reflected the national basis. The establishment of the political superstructure was strongly influenced by the foreign sector which dominated these countries' economies. This was important for the African countries because it gave rise to superstructural phenomena which later served as a basis for the formulation of political demands, determination of the structure of new political power, forms of state system, etc.

Some bourgeois authors, analysing the relation between the basis and the superstructure in the new national states, note the following distinction: while in the developed capitalist countries social changes followed development, in Africa social demands are ahead of social development. French sociologist Albert Meister, for instance, affirms that in the newly-independent African countries "the modern ways of thinking and aspirations are ahead of the productive possibilities of satisfying these aspirations".[1] But it is not only a matter simply of aspirations which arose as the African countries acquainted themselves with life in the developed capitalist countries but one of their legitimate urge to choose the path of development which would assure fast economic and social progress.

The low-level capitalist development is responsible for the extremely motley social-class structure of the African countries. Very often within one and the same country one sees tribal, feudal, capitalist and numerous transitional forms of social relations all at once. The continuing process of class formation has created in many African countries a situation that is distinguished by the fact that none of the social classes can direct their socio-economic and political development all by itself.

The duration of the non-capitalist development is determined by the objective conditions and will probably extend over more than one decade.

The reduction of this period depends on many external and internal factors, including the extent to which the

---

[1] Albert Meister, *L'Afrique, peut-elle partir? Changement social et développement en Afrique oriental*, Paris, 1966, p. 335.

domestic and foreign policies of the national democratic state will take into account and speak for the interests of all progressive, democratic and revolutionary forces striving for national emancipation and social progress.

The formation and development of such a state and the determination of its functions in each concrete phase are of exceptional significance for the destinies of the national liberation movement. The main purpose and historical role of a progressive national democratic state is gradually to reorganise the old society and thus pave the way to the next stage of transition to a developed society in which socialist relations will predominate.

The African countries remain within the world capitalist economic system after they have freed themselves from the colonial fetters. But this does not mean that a progressive independent national democratic state cannot break with capitalism and embark upon the path of development according with the interests of the nation. Experience shows that such a choice is both possible and promising. And the more and the better the revolutionary democratic forces in power in the progressive newly-free African countries use the positive contribution made by the progressive social classes and groups to national development, the bigger the success they score on the path of non-capitalist development. One cannot, therefore, agree with those who claim that the difficulties and the complications of all sorts attending the new African states' transition to the non-capitalist path of development "prove" that the very idea is erroneous. It would be wrong to attribute them solely to the subjective mistakes of the leaders of the national liberation movement and to ignore the objective character of these difficulties which is determined by the conditions in which this progressive social process takes place—in the conditions when this movement, as Academician Zhukov has aptly put it, had to "start from scratch or from an even lower level".[1] The more backward the country was before independence and the more pernicious the colonial legacy, the more complex are the problems confronting the people embarking upon the path of social progress and the effort they have to put in to build a new society.

---

[1] *International Affairs*, Moscow, No. 5, 1967, p. 53.

That is why one cannot agree with the view that the progressive forces of the new African countries will not be able to control the situation well enough to direct their countries towards socialism until capitalist rule is abolished the world over. Some exponents of this point of view affirm that every time the revolutionary democratic forces tried to carry out radical socio-economic reforms that would bring the country to the non-capitalist path, the national revolution bogged down and the local reactionary forces took the upper hand. Hence the erroneous conclusion that the problem of non-capitalist development is practically unsolvable and remains purely theoretical. Hence the conclusion that in the present conditions the revolutionary democratic forces in Africa can do nothing but wait until the world socialist system, in its competition with world capitalism, ensures the progressive African countries' well-nigh automatic transition to the non-capitalist path of development.

The choice of path is a struggle, first and foremost. And as every struggle, it has its tides, its ups and downs and complications. The struggle for the non-capitalist path of development reflects in each given moment the correlation of the class forces and the sharpness of the class struggle.

In these conditions it is of practical importance to work out the kinds of forms of politically organising the masses and to achieve the level of democracy that will assure the wide participation and interest of the working masses in the progressive social development of their countries. This is one of the most urgent tasks facing the new national African states during the struggle for the choice of the path of development. It goes without saying that the deliberate restraint of the process of democratisation, however complicated it may be, is apt to impede the solution of the general democratic tasks of the national liberation revolution. And the insufficiently active participation of the masses in public and political affairs may bring about a situation in which the reactionary forces will try to put an end to progressive steps by engineering plots and military coups. It is because of inadequate democratisation of public affairs that the reactionary forces have so far succeeded here and there in carrying out their counter-revolutionary plans, without meeting

with sufficiently strong resistance from the broad masses. If the working masses were given a possibility to take a more active part in the revolutionary renovation of society, the newly-independent African countries would find it easier to deal with the endless plots and intrigues of the external and internal reactionary forces.

What is more, without the active participation of the working masses in the revolution, without their display of initiative, it is altogether impossible to consummate progressive socio-economic reforms and pave the way to the next stage of the progressive African countries' advance to socialism.

The question of extending and strengthening democracy will gradually prevail over all other problems along with the social development of these countries, for without the active and conscious participation of the working masses it is impossible socially to reorganise society.

Increasing attention is paid in a number of progressive African countries to the question of strengthening state political systems and especially to the elaboration of the forms of politically organising the masses that would be most acceptable and accord best with their social and national conditions. Much importance is attached in this connection to building up political parties which would reflect the ideology of the toiling classes and carry out their activities with full knowledge of the objective laws of social development.

This process runs differently in different African countries. But many of them have one thing in common: they have proclaimed the principle of one-party system of government.

The ideologues of neo-colonialism and their followers in the newly-independent countries usually bitterly criticise the one-party system, claiming that it leads to the infringement of democratic freedoms. Being champions of the so-called parliamentary democracy of the West European and American kind, they refer to democracy in general as a "non-class" or "supra-class" category. But no such democracy has ever existed anywhere. It has always upheld the interests of some definite class. That is why the existence of a one-party and multi-party system cannot by itself serve as a gauge of the level of development of the democratic institutes of one or another country. The

main thing is the character of the ruling party and whose interests it speaks for.

In the countries of tropical Africa with insufficiently advanced class differentiation it is quite possible for political parties to spring up from mass national movements. Here is what President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania wrote on this score: "The new nations of the African continent are emerging today as the result of their struggle for independence. This struggle for freedom from foreign domination is a patriotic one which necessarily leaves no room for differences. It unites all elements in the country so that, not only in Africa but in any other part of the world facing a similar challenge, these countries are led by a nationalist movement rather than by a political party or parties. The same nationalist movement, having united the people and led them to independence, must inevitably form the first government of the new state; it could hardly be expected that a united country should balk in midstream and voluntarily divide itself into opposing political groups just for the sake of conforming to what I have called the 'Anglo-Saxon form of democracy' at the moment of independence. Indeed, why should it? Surely, if a government is freely elected by the people, there can be nothing undemocratic about it simply because nearly all the people rather than merely a section of them have chosen to vote it into power."[1]

The bourgeois critics of the one-party system in Africa are not worried by problems of democracy. They are worried by the determination of some of the new states to free themselves from imperialist domination and take the path of social progress. It is this that explains why the bourgeois champions of democracy direct their fire at the progressive countries, although it is well known that there are one-party systems in some of the West-oriented countries too.

The one-party system of government in many African countries also owes its rise and development to their desire to put an end to tribal divisions which the colonialists preserved and used to build the political structures they wanted. In the Kinshasa Congo, for instance, the colonialists banned national political parties and organi-

[1] *Africa Speaks*, New York, 1961, p. 33.

sations and instead imposed on the Congolese all sorts of tribal associations. This led to the formation of a vast number of small parties since the Congo is composed of about 70 ethnic groups. Suffice it to say that over 100 political parties participated in the 1959-60 parliamentary elections. And for the seven seats at stake in the House of Representatives in Kinshasa in March 1965, there were 305 candidates nominated by 65 parties.[1]

A similar situation prevailed in Nigeria and certain other African countries before their liberation. But does this justify the claim that there was democracy in the African colonies?

The peoples of Africa are against the mechanical transplantation of the West-European and American models of bourgeois democracy onto their soil. Knowing that they are powerless to impose an alien way of life and thinking upon the newly-free African countries, the ideologues of neo-colonialism now seek to prove that there can be no democracy in these countries.

There are authors, like Fenner Brockway of the British Labour Party, for instance, who allege that the African conditions are not conducive to liberal societies and that, consequently, democratic socialism, combining personal rights with economic collectivism, has only limited endorsement.[2] And if bourgeois authors do sometimes admit partial democracy as possible in African countries, it is "only if the elite has a very powerful will to be democratic—only if it is willing to be the teacher and parent of democracy in a society which by its nature does not incline in that direction—and if, furthermore, it gets enough of the right kind of assistance from abroad".[3]

The political system of any country takes shape under the influence of objective factors, notably under the influence of its people's national and democratic traditions. What is progressive for one country and accords with the objective conditions in it may have a negative effect on

---

[1] Dorothy Dodge, *African Politics in Perspective*, Princeton, N.Y., 1968, pp. 156-57.

[2] Fenner Brockway, *African Socialism*, London, 1963, pp. 22-23.

[3] *Development and Society. The Dynamics of Economic Change.* Ed. by David E. Novack and Robert Lekachman, New York, 1964, p. 404.

another. Even one and the same development in different conditions may have different consequences for the national liberation struggle. This also applies to the one-party system of government existing in some African countries. It's one thing when this system is a natural outcome of the national movement and is based on it, uniting all the revolutionary and democratic forces. And it is quite another when an attempt is made to apply this system in conditions in which there are different progressive and revolutionary parties and in which a single party is not formed through the voluntary merger of the existing progressive parties and the adoption of the most progressive political, ideological and organisational platform but through the expulsion of the most progressive and revolutionary forces from the political scene.

Unfortunately, the leaders of some of the newly-free African countries approached this problem in a somewhat simplified manner, thinking that the one-party system was a panacea for all ills. It is not difficult, of course, to understand the desire of the national leaders to oppose the attempts made by the external and internal reactionary forces to split the national front of the progressive forces with a single efficient mechanism of socio-political structure. The more far-reaching the social reforms undertaken in a newly-free country, the more bitter and tougher the resistance of the privileged classes and groups, and the more active the attempts to speed up the formation of a single progressive party.

The establishment of a one-party system obviously should not be regarded merely as a merger of the existing progressive parties within the framework of a single political organisation. It should be regarded as a union on the basis of a jointly elaborated progressive ideological platform and not as the establishment of the monopoly of one party and the dissolution of the other revolutionary parties and organisations on the grounds that the party displaying the initiative is in power. Such an approach may damage the unity of all the patriotic, revolutionary and democratic forces and cause the masses to withdraw from participation in the country's political affairs. And that, in its turn, may sharply exacerbate the political situation in the country and weaken the united front of struggle against imperialism and internal reaction.

The choice of direction in which the independent African countries develop is determined in the bitter struggle in which all classes, political parties and organisations are involved in one way or another. The forces retarding social progress and standing for the capitalist path of development are still quite strong. Some are striving for the victory of capitalist relations by indulging in demagogic phraseology, others bitterly resist progressive development.

In these conditions it is very important to know whether the revolutionary democratic parties already in power and those that are not but may come to power will be able to rally round the programme of non-capitalist development all the progressive forces of the nation, isolate the reactionary elements and bring the national liberation revolutions to their consummation.

The intensification of the struggle of the opposing trends over the choice of the path of development is a distinctive trait of the present stage of the African revolution. This struggle will be long, for the independent African countries must solve complicated and essentially new political, economic and ideological problems in building a new society. Addressing the delegates of the Second All-Russia Congress of the Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, Lenin said: "I must say that the Russian Bolsheviks have succeeded in forcing a breach in the old imperialism, in undertaking the exceedingly difficult, but also exceedingly noble task of blazing new paths of revolution, whereas you, the representatives of the working people of the East, have before you a task that is still greater and newer."[1] The non-capitalist development of the African countries which have freed themselves from colonial fetters is one of the new paths to socialism of which Lenin spoke.

Despite its complexity, this path is showing the masses that in the present conditions it offers the best possibilities for eliminating their age-old backwardness and raising their living standard.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159.

SOCIALIST TRENDS IN AFRICA AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

One of the distinctive features of the political situation in Africa is the prevalence of socialist trends in many newly-free countries.

What is the reason for this new development for Africa?

The disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism and the liberation of the colonial and dependent nations are a direct outcome of the defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism in the Second World War and the victory of socialist revolutions in many European and Asian countries. The emergence of socialism from the bounds of one country and the formation of the world socialist system radically altered the correlation of forces in the world, stimulated the upsurge of the democratic movement all over the world and created favourable conditions for the dissemination of socialist ideas. These ideas are being adopted more and more by the participants in the national liberation movement, notably by the forces which have come to power in many newly-free countries and which pin their hopes of quickly achieving national and social emancipation on socialism, though they do not always have a clear understanding of this concept.

The national liberation movement is entering the stage of its history when socialism is advocated not only by the Marxists, the staunch proponents of the socialist system, but by progressive nationalists. This tendency began to gain strength after the acquisition of political independence by the colonies. Very many sovereign African states have proclaimed socialist development their official policy.

The new African states' preference for socialism may be explained by important socio-economic considerations, by their disbelief in capitalism's ability to solve the problems confronting them.

One should also note that they see in socialism a possibility to revive the national and historical traditions of the African peoples, their social system which, some ideolo-

gists of "African socialism" affirm, has always had socialist traits. In the opinion of Bakari Traoré, Mamadou Lô and Jean-Louis Alibert, authors of the book *Political Forces in Black Africa*, tropical Africa is a "land of socialist traditions. It is distinguished by the relations of solidarity prevailing in the traditional African societies. The individual and his social group are not two distinct realities, much less antagonistic realities, but one and the same reality".[1]

Among the other reasons for such wide popularity of socialist ideas in Africa the authors mention as indisputable the fact that socialist ideas serve the African peoples as weapons in their struggle against colonial domination, for economic and social progress. "In the particular case of economic development," they say, "it is incontestable that the socialist transformations in countries like the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China have exerted a profound influence on the political thinking of the African leaders."[2] In Africa, they write, Marxism presents itself in two aspects: "First as an explanatory model of the processes of colonisation and decolonisation and then as a technical model of economic growth."[3]

There are substantial differences among the socialist trends in Africa, due not only to the peculiarities of the different countries and areas but to their attitude to scientific socialism. A class approach to the appraisal of the different socialist trends in Africa alone makes it possible correctly to determine their essence and the basic tendencies of development, their attitude to scientific socialism, and the nature of the transformations within the framework of the officially proclaimed socialist doctrines. It may be said that some socialist trends in Africa are close to scientific socialism, others are farther removed, and still others are antipodes of scientific socialism.

One thing common to most of the socialist trends in the African countries is the criticism of capitalism,

---

[1] Bakari Traoré, Mamadou Lô and Jean-Louis Alibert, *Forces politiques en Afrique noire*, Paris, 1966, p. 165.

[2] Ibid., p. 166.

[3] Ibid., p. 167.

although it is levelled from different social-class positions. The Charter of National Action of the Arab Socialist Union stresses that "those who call for freedom of capital, imagining it to be the road to progress, are gravely mistaken. In the countries forced to remain underdeveloped, capital in its natural development is no longer able to lead the economic drive."[1]

The broad urban and rural masses in the independent African countries gauge capitalism by their own recent colonial past. In their minds, there is no difference between colonial oppression and capitalism. That is why even in the countries that have taken the capitalist path of development the ruling parties are compelled to criticise capitalism and proclaim socialist slogans if they want to win the masses over. In most of the African countries the forces openly advocating capitalism are insignificant. The national bourgeoisie there is economically weak and in many countries has in fact not yet taken shape as a class. African society, in which capitalism was represented chiefly by foreign monopolies, was not embraced widely by capitalist relations of production. The absence of private ownership of land in many parts of Africa and of large enterprises owned by the local bourgeoisie objectively creates conditions for these countries to take the non-capitalist path of development.

In some African countries the national bourgeoisie had formed before they won political independence but in most cases, as the developments have shown, it has proved incapable of solving the problem of building up the national economy along the capitalist lines and this has led to stronger criticism of capitalism.

Even the ideologists of neo-colonialism are now forced to admit that "capitalism is rejected and socialism preferred for moral as well as economic reasons"[2] in almost all African countries. American Prof. Hans Morgenthau stresses that the Soviet Union has achieved "what the more enlightened underdeveloped nations seek: a drastic increase in national output through rapid industrialisa-

---

[1] *The Charter*, Cairo, 1962, p. 50.

[2] *The Ideologies of the Developing Nations*. Edited and with an Introduction by Paul E. Sigmund Jr., New York, Washington, London, 1964, p. 12.

tion.... Seeking the same results, the underdeveloped nations cannot help being attracted by the methods which brought about these results elsewhere. In contrast, the slow process, stretching over centuries, through which the nations of the West achieved a high standard of living through industrialisation must appeal much less to them."[1]

It is very significant that in present-day Africa no leader of the national liberation movement can count on popularity and the people's support if he openly champions the capitalist path of development. Capitalism offers no way to mobilise the African peoples to build up a national industry and stimulate political and labour enthusiasm.

As a social system, capitalism has historically outlived itself in the sense that its day is over and the era of socialism has set in. Today, when the non-capitalist path of development is becoming a tangible reality for many independent African countries, irrespective of the level of their socio-economic development, the trends arising in them as a rule do not confine themselves to the bourgeois democratic programme of action. Their programmes are also definitely anti-capitalist. Objectively, these programmes—some more, others less—lead not so much to clearing the way to capitalism (although such a possibility should not be fully excluded) as to aggravating the crisis of capitalist relations.

Therein lies their main difference from the programmes of the petty-bourgeois socialism of the era of developing capitalism. This does not mean, however, that the new African states can switch over to the non-capitalist path—the path that leads to socialism—almost automatically, without a bitter class struggle.

The eyes of the progressive Africans are on the socialist states which have within the lifetime of one generation made tremendous progress in the development of their productive forces. With the experience of the socialist countries before them, many national liberation movement leaders come to the conclusion that private enterprise is

---

[1] Hans Morgenthau, "A Political Theory of Foreign Aid", *The American Political Science Review*, New York, 1962, Vol. LVI, No. 2, p. 306.

economically ineffective and that the only real way to eliminate their own countries' economic backwardness is to manage the economy along the socialist lines.

The very rejection of the capitalist path of development is a progressive phenomenon. It helps undermine the political position of foreign and local capital and facilitates the dissemination of the ideas of scientific socialism.

Because of the socio-economic conditions in the African countries (numerical and organisational weakness of the working class, insignificant experience of political struggle, the masses' backwardness inherited from colonialism, non-existence of a proletarian political party in most of the countries, etc.), social trends there have not shaped into an integral, genuinely scientific world outlook. Ideologically, they are a conglomerate of heterogeneous and contradictory views (religious, utopian, reformist, populist, etc.). But in the struggle for the development of the national African revolution and under the influence of objective processes, these trends are accepting and will probably go on accepting to an increasing extent the principles of scientific socialism, which is not only a theory today but a practice embodied by the world socialist system.

Lenin foresaw that the representatives of socialist trends would gradually embrace scientific socialism as a result of changes in living conditions, the development of industry, the growth and consolidation of the working class, and the growing political awareness of the masses. He wrote that "Marxism is most easily, rapidly, completely and lastingly assimilated by the working class and its ideologists where large-scale industry is most developed. Economic relations which are backward, or which lag in their development, constantly lead to the appearance of supporters of the labour movement who assimilate only certain aspects of Marxism, only certain parts of the new world outlook, or individual slogans and demands, being unable to make a determined break with all the traditions of the bourgeois world outlook in general and the bourgeois-democratic world outlook in particular."[1]

Almost every trend of socialist thought in Africa upholds its own understanding of socialism, advances its own

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 348.

programme for building a socialist society, claiming that it alone is correct. Let us take a look at the most characteristic viewpoints on socialism.

In his book *The Elements of African Socialism*—a pretentious attempt to generalise the ideas of "African socialism"—Nigerian sociologist Father Bede Onuoha affirms that its blue-print should "be sought in the home-bred socialist pattern bequeathed us by our ancestors" and proposes "a return to the wisdom and value of our fathers".[1] The basic principles of "African socialism," he says, are fraternity, leadership, dialogue, planned development, harmony, autonomy, positive neutrality, and Pan-humanism. The first three are borrowed from the traditional African concept of family and community, the fourth from world socialism, and the fifth—harmony—is represented as a correction introduced by the Africans into the experience of both the economically developed socialist and capitalist countries. "If our blue-print is the traditional African economic structure," he writes, "then there is no doubt that African socialism has for its objective the widest possible dispersion (as opposed to concentration) of ownership."[2]

The main aim of socialism, Father Onuoha says, is to ensure that people get their "legitimate share in the fruits of their labour".[3] And so despite his irreconcilable attitude towards capitalism, whose main evil, in his opinion, is unjust distribution, he nevertheless borrows his elements from the European petty-bourgeois socialist conceptions, modernising them slightly to fit in with the African traditions. Actually, he advocates the substitution of the European system of capitalist profit by a local system which would enable workers to own their enterprises and share in their profits. Hence the conclusion that "African socialism may be defined as a radical form of economic democracy dedicated to the elimination through legislation of the European system of capitalistic profiteering, but not of private enterprise."[4]

---

[1] Father Bede Onuoha, *The Elements of African Socialism*, London, 1965, p. 37.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., p. 50.
[4] Ibid., p. 133.

The essentially same tendency to replace foreign capitalism by local may be seen in the programme of the ruling party in that country,[1] the Kenya African National Union. It devotes much space to such economic problems as agricultural development, creation of a basis for a more rapid growth of industry, assurance of fuller employment, efficient use of natural resources, etc. It even admits that economic planning is essential for the country's rapid economic development. But the authors of this programme hope to promote this development chiefly by capitalist methods, with the unlimited aid of foreign capital.

The compilers of the programme actually propose freely to "borrow from foreign governments and international institutions and stimulate the inflow of private capital from abroad".[2] They advise to abstain from nationalising foreign property in order not to "discourage additional private investment".[3] Nationalisation, in their opinion, is useful only when "the assets in private hands threaten the security or undermine the integrity of the nation" and when "other less costly means of control are not available or are not effective".[4] At the same time they stress the need to encourage national capital. "If human dignity and freedom are to be preserved," they say, "provision must be made for both activities by the individual—consumption and accumulation."[5]

A careful study of this document leaves no doubt that its authors prefer the capitalist system which they would like to adapt, with slight modifications, to the African conditions. The natural desire to make full use of the traditional African forms leads its authors to draw a line between "African socialism" and "European socialism", to affirm that in the "traditional African society" there is no place for the sharp contradictions and conflicts characteristic of the West-European countries.

The same idea has been voiced by Tom Mboya, one of the Kenyan ideologists of "African socialism". Here is

---

[1] *African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya*, Nairobi, p. 12.
[2] Ibid., p. 19.
[3] Ibid., p. 26.
[4] Ibid., p. 27.
[5] Ibid., p. 12.

what he wrote in 1963: "European socialism was born of the agrarian and industrial revolutions, which divided society into the landed and the capitalists on one side and the landless and the industrial proletariat on the other. There is no division into such classes in Africa, where states came to nationhood through the pressure of mass movements and where governments consist of the leaders of the workers and peasants, rather than the nobility who have ruled in Europe."[1]

The proponents of "African socialism" are apt to regard it as a doctrine designed to substantiate the possibility of a "third road" somewhere between capitalism and scientific socialism. But behind this argument about the "third road," which is also advocated by some champions of "African socialism" in Senegal, for instance, one sees the same attempts to transfer to African soil the bourgeois-reformist concepts of socialism that are widely current in the capitalist West. It is not surprising, therefore, that the ideas of "African socialism", as interpreted by President Leopold Senghor of Senegal, meet with no support in Africa.

"African socialism" in the view of its proponents is basically a political system that is turned more to Africa's past than to its present and future. Some authors are worried far more by the problem of modernising the traditional African society than by the problem of developing the productive forces which are indispensable for building a new society.

Whenever the question of the economic development of the independent African countries arises, it is interpreted either as conversion of the natural economy into commodity production or as the establishment of an "economy of consumption". The main features of "African socialism", in the opinion of the authors of *African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya*, are the following:

"I. Political democracy;

"II. Mutual social responsibility;

"III. Various forms of ownership;

"IV. A range of controls to ensure that property is used in the mutual interests of society and its members;

[1] Tom Mboya, *Freedom and After*, London, 1963, p. 167.

"V. Diffusion of ownership to avoid concentration of economic power;

"VI. Progressive taxes to ensure an equitable distribution of wealth and income.

"Characteristics I, II, III and IV are based directly on African traditions."[1]

Although the champions of "African socialism" like to speak of collective African traditions, community of interests, absence of class antagonisms, and so on, this doctrine is nevertheless very far from recognising the right of the masses to participate actively in the administration of the state and in public affairs. In this sense, "African socialism" is rather a system of an oligarchic nature set up by a handful of privileged people who are concerned more about their own well-being than about the needs of the working masses and their material and cultural level. Perhaps that is why the masses are, as a rule, indifferent to the steps taken to promote "African socialism." The leaders of the countries that have proclaimed themselves adherents of "African socialism" very often themselves complain of lack of enthusiasm among the masses.

There are, however, proponents of socialist trends in the developing African countries who do not contrapose their conceptions to scientific socialism. Some of the revolutionary democratic parties, for instance. The UAR Charter of National Action says: "Scientific socialism is the suitable style for finding the right method leading to progress. No other method can definitely achieve the desired progress."[2] Pointing out that "the Arab revolutionary experiment ... cannot afford to copy what the others have achieved," the Charter stresses: "This, however, does not mean that the national struggle of peoples and nations is today required to create new conceptions for its great objectives, but rather to find the methods suited to the trend of general evolution and the changing nature of the world."[3]

The Charter thus defines socialism: "Socialism is the

---

[1] *African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya*, p. 16.

[2] *The Charter*, p. 50.

[3] Ibid., p. 15.

way to social freedom. Social freedom cannot be realised except through an equal opportunity for every citizen to obtain a fair share of the national wealth. This is not confined to the mere redistribution of the national wealth among the citizens but foremost and above all it requires expanding the base of this national wealth, to accede to the lawful rights of the working masses. This means that socialism, with its two supports, sufficiency and justice, is the way to social freedom."[1]

Although the Charter does not explain what is a "fair share" and is not sufficiently explicit about the attitude to private property, it shows that its authors are well aware of the need to take resolute steps against reaction "which does not wish to give up its monopolies or its privileged position from which it continues to exploit the people".[2] This provision is of fundamental importance. It has been prompted by life itself.

The leaders of the Egyptian revolution, it might be recalled, at first hoped to promote the country's economic and social progress by capitalist methods.

The Egyptian national bourgeoisie's disloyalty, however, made it necessary to take firmer measures against it. This necessity was brought about by the logic of class struggle and the political situation in the country. Egyptian publicist Mohammed Wahby, author of the book *Arab Socialism*, says the new regime's attempts to co-operate with the Egyptian bourgeoisie failed because the latter was interested only in making profits and disregarded national tasks. This, the author stresses, compelled the Nasser Government to take decisive steps—to go ahead with nationalisation, establish a public sector, introduce economic planning, etc. It is difficult, however, to agree with the author that the Charter of National Action laid the theoretical basis for the country's socialist transformation.[3]

The socio-economic reforms carried out in Egypt, Algeria, Guinea and certain other African countries are spearheaded against imperialism and colonialism. By their nature, they are also to a certain extent anti-capitalist.

---

[1] *The Charter*, p. 49.
[2] Ibid., p. 44.
[3] Mohammed Wahby, *Arab Socialism*, New Delhi, 1966.

The fact that the proponents of socialist trends in the progressive African countries sometimes display tolerance towards the existence of other forms of ownership along with the public sector in no way refutes this conclusion but merely testifies to the fact that the national patriotic forces take the realities into consideration. The multi-structural economy of these countries reflects the objective peculiarity of the transitional period, and "leaping over" some of the necessary stages may alienate many social strata, attached to one extent or another to the institutes of private ownership, from the national revolution and turn them into opponents of the broad socio-economic reforms paving the way to the next phase in the advance towards socialism.

In the implementation of general democratic and anti-capitalist reforms (nationalisation of foreign capitalist property, agrarian reforms, planning, restriction and partial nationalisation of local capital, etc.), the revolutionary democratic forces in the progressive developing African countries proceed from the experience accumulated by the socialist states and the views and conceptions they themselves have formed in the process of building a new society. And although the theoretical thought in these countries is still far from having fully recognised scientific socialism on a number of important issues, there are many measures that are progressive in nature and create the material and social conditions for building a socialist society.

While the champions of socialist trends in Africa do not always have a sufficiently clear idea about the socialism, which they intend to build, they know even less about the ways and means to use to achieve this aim.

The concrete forms and conditions in which the progressive African countries will advance to socialism are probably going to differ considerably both from what things were in the past and what they will be in the developed capitalist states.

It is quite natural that books on socialism published in the developing African countries make an effort to determine the forms of socialist development by taking into consideration their specific social and national conditions. There is a widespread view in some countries of tropical Africa, for instance, that the traditional African

society can become the basis of socialist development. As far back as before the Second World War the well-known Nigerian politician, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, wrote that "African society is essentially socialistic".[1] This conclusion was usually based on the fact that, to quote President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, in African society everybody was a worker. "There was no other way of earning a living," he wrote. "Even the Elder, who appeared to be enjoying himself without doing any work and for whom everybody else appeared to be working, had, in fact, worked hard all his younger days. The wealth he now appeared to possess was not his, personally; it was only 'his' as the Elder of the group which had produced it. He was its guardian. The wealth itself gave him neither power nor prestige."[2] And further: "In our traditional African society we were individuals within a community. We took care of the community, and the community took care of us. We neither needed nor wished to exploit our fellow men. And in rejecting the capitalist attitude of mind which colonialism brought into Africa, we must reject also the capitalist methods which go with it. One of these is the individual ownership of land. To us in Africa land was always recognised as belonging to the community."[3]

Characteristically, very many proponents of socialist trends in Africa regarded the rural community as one of the decisive forms of the African countries' transition to socialism. But while for some—for Nyerere, for instance—it not only offers an opportunity to preserve traditionally equal relations among people but makes high productivity necessary to ensure a fair distribution of labour and remuneration for labour, others regard it chiefly as "proof" that there were no classes in Africa in the past and none today. *African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya* says: "The sharp class divisions that once existed in Europe have no place in African socialism and no parallel in African society. No class problem arose in

---

[1] Mokwugo Okoye, *African Responses*, Ilfracombe (Devonshire), 1964, p. 296.

[2] Julius Nyerere, *Essays on Socialism*, Dar es Salaam, Nairobi, London, New York, Oxford University Press, 1968, pp. 4-5.

[3] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

the traditional African society and none exists today among Africans."[1]

The possibility of using the rural community to build socialism is widely discussed in the African countries, particularly south of the Sahara. Without denying the importance of this issue, one nevertheless can hardly agree with those who lay the whole stress on the rural community, regarding it as well-nigh the central problem in all African countries. American sociologist Walter H. Drew, for instance, affirms that "transformation of the traditional rural economic group—family, clan, or village—into a modern, high-productivity organisation is a central problem in every African development programme".[2] In his opinion, the African idea of socialism is that "traditional farms can be transmuted readily and directly into large-scale, technologically advanced farms if the government supplies managerial direction and mechanised equipment".[3]

Much attention to this problem was paid by the well-known Soviet student of Africa Ivan Potekhin who believed that the African village community could be the form enabling the African countries to pass directly to socialism without going through the capitalist stage, that it could be the starting point of non-capitalist development and socialist construction. True, he invariably stressed that "the decisive factor is the existence of internal forces capable of directing their advance along this path, i.e., who will ultimately wield power, what party will be at the helm of the government".[4]

Theoretically, this question has been widely dealt with and thoroughly analysed in Marxist literature. The possibility of passing to socialism through the village community, without going through the capitalist stage, existed in Russia too. Russian revolutionary democrats saw the rudiments of socialism in the village commune. Marx who was well familiar with their views, notably with the views of Nikolai Chernyshevsky, wrote in this connection that

---

[1] *African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya*, p. 12.

[2] Walter H. Drew, "How Socialist *Are* African Economics?", *Africa Report*, Washington, May 1963, Vol. 8, No. 5, p. 13.

[3] Ibid.

[4] I. I. Potekhin, *Africa Looks Ahead*, Moscow, 1960, p. 25.

while Russian liberal economists held that "Russia must begin by destroying the village community in order to pass to the capitalist regime", there were others who thought that "she can without experiencing the tortures of this regime appropriate all its fruits by developing the historical conditions specifically her own" and that "he (Chernyshevsky) pronounces in favour of this latter solution".[1]

The founders of scientific communism said that, in certain historical conditions, it was quite possible to reorganise society along the socialist lines and to use the village community as the point of departure. In their Preface to the second Russian edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Marx and Engels wrote: "Now the question is: can the Russian *obshchina* (village community), though greatly undermined, yet a form of the primeval common ownership of land, pass directly to the higher form of communist common ownership? Or, on the contrary, must it first pass through the same process of dissolution as constitutes the historical evolution of the West?

"The only answer to that possible today is this: If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that both complement each other, the present Russian common ownership of land may serve as the starting-point for a communist development."[2]

In the conditions prevailing in Africa today it is not to be excluded that for some countries the village community may become the basis and the starting point for non-capitalist development leading to socialism. It is characteristic of most of the African countries, however, that the system of common landownership disintegrates more and more along with the development of commodity-monetary relations and agricultural commodity production. New-type relations are beginning to undermine communal order even in the backward parts of the African continent, where agriculture is still semi-natural and the extent of the property and social differentiation of the rural population is insignificant. As for areas with rela-

[1] Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 311.
[2] Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 100-01.

tively developed agricultural commodity production, this differentiation has assumed rather considerable proportions.

Almost all the socialist programmes proclaimed by the revolutionary-democratic forces in the African countries give preference to measures which, in the opinion of their authors, would yield immediate positive results and quickly bring about the solution of the complex socio-economic problems confronting the newly-free countries. The haste with which socio-economic reforms (nationalisation, elimination of the private sector, etc.) were at times carried out created new difficulties, particularly in the economic field.

Of late one is witnessing a more sober approach to problems, abstention from hasty measures liable to complicate the situation in the country. This is especially characteristic of the Arusha Declaration which has proclaimed that Tanzania will build socialism, and of the Principles and Development memorandum addressed to the people by Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere. Rightly pointing out that the problem of economic development was difficult and would take a long time to solve, the memorandum stressed that this development depended chiefly on the efforts and industry of the people themselves.

An analogical situation is taking shape in Algeria, Guinea and certain other countries where the experience accumulated in the process of non-capitalist development shows that it is necessary to follow a more realistic policy in the economic field. It is not a simple matter. On the one hand, as experience shows (in Guinea, for instance), 100 per cent nationalisation, extending to trade and services, is apt to cause serious economic difficulties in the country which arouse the political discontent of the masses. This makes it objectively necessary and expedient to permit the operation, temporarily and on a restricted scale, of the private sector. If economically more developed countries taking the socialist path of development could not fully get along without the private sector (New Economic Policy in the Soviet Union, private sector in the German Democratic Republic, Poland, etc.), how can the African countries whose economic level is extremely low?

On the other hand, it does not follow that the lower the economic level of the country taking the socialist path, the greater the preference to be shown to the private sector. There is no direct link here. Highly disputable, therefore, are the suggestions that African countries should abstain well-nigh completely from nationalisation because it "would discourage additional private investment, thus reducing further the rate of growth of the economy".[1]

The difficulties encountered on the path of socio-economic transformations are due not only to the backwardness of the new African states but also to the fact that quite often they are carried out "from above" with the aid of the state machine which in many cases has not changed substantially since the declaration of independence, by bureaucratic methods, without the necessary preparation and sufficiently wide assistance of the masses. Unless the working masses take an active part in planning an economic policy, they cannot be its active proponents. This does not help the toiling classes to develop a new attitude to labour, and without that it is impossible to raise labour productivity appreciably and, consequently, successfully to develop the productive forces.

More than 100 years ago Marx and Engels, analysing different types and varieties of socialist trends, arrived at the important conclusion that "the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

"In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time.

"Finally, they labour everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries."[2]

This basic Marxist principle holds good today too, defining the attitude of the proponents of scientific socialism to the socialist trends in the developing world. Marxists-Leninists believe that there is no insuperable wall between the socialist trends and views that have become widespread in the independent African countries and scientific

---

[1] *African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya*, p. 26.

[2] Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 137.

socialism, for the national liberation revolutions are not only expanding but growing deeper and by their aims, scope and nature often transcend the bounds of bourgeois-democratic revolutions. Marxists-Leninists attentively study, firmly support and develop all that is valuable in the socialist doctrines of the newly-free countries, particularly all that substantiates the need of their joining efforts in implementing anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-capitalist transformations.

Lenin wrote that "he would be a poor Marxist indeed who, while criticising the falsity of a socialist disguise for bourgeois slogans, failed to appreciate their historically progressive significance as the most decisive *bourgeois* slogans in the struggle *against serfdom*".[1] At the same time he sharply criticised the petty-bourgeois Socialists' attempts to substitute their own conceptions for scientific socialism, claiming that they alone show the way how socialist society should be built. Marxists-Leninists hold that no social development, even in the most outlying part of the world, can be correctly understood if the character of the present epoch, whose main content is mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, is ignored. "The Communist parties, in civilised and backward countries alike," Lenin said, "can pose and solve political problems correctly only if they make this postulate their starting-point."[2]

The appearance of different socialist doctrines in many newly-independent African countries is a direct result of the vast successes of the world socialist system and the growing influence of socialist ideas which are becoming increasingly popular throughout the world. This being the case, the struggle for the broad masses which appreciate and understand progressive socialist trends is an important element of the ideological battle waged by the proletariat and its vanguard for the prevalence of the socialist principles, for democracy and progress. This struggle is facilitated by the fact that many of the programmes proclaiming the building of socialism the main objective were adopted during the national liberation,

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 237.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 241.

anti-imperialist struggle and were inspired by Marxist-Leninist ideas and the successes of the world socialist community.

Marxists consider it their duty, in explaining the real meaning of scientific socialism to the masses, to seek for ways of co-operating with different socialist trends, supporting all that is progressive and criticising their negative aspects. Many socialist trends in Africa are contradictory, inconsistent, eclectic. It should also be borne in mind that, as a rule, they do not express only petty-bourgeois interests. To one extent or another, they are also expressive of the aspirations of the national bourgeoisie. This may be explained by the latter's ideological hegemony over the petty-bourgeois masses during the struggle for political independence, its position as the ruling class in a number of African countries, and the coincidence of the interests of the national bourgeoisie and the urban and rural petty-bourgeois strata on many questions of social development.

The ideology of the national bourgeoisie is infiltrating into "national socialism". In some countries the process is so far advanced that the carefully elaborated "national socialism" has become the nucleus of the ideological conceptions of the national bourgeoisie, its official state policy. What is more, the petty-bourgeois aspects of "national socialism" have been subordinated to the ideology and the class interests of the nascent bourgeoisie.

It should also be said that socialist trends in the newly-free African countries are often nationalistically-tinted. It is well known that the upswing of the national liberation movement in the African colonies, inspired by nationalism and particularly by Pan-Africanism, led to the transformation of nationalism into a broad and deep ideological trend rooted in the predominantly petty-bourgeois social structure of these countries. During the liberation struggle that preceded the conquest of political independence, the broad masses supported the ideas of Pan-Africanism which united the African peoples in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. Pan-Africanism remains the ideology of many trends standing for African unity on regional or continental scale. Some authors affirm that the African countries are going

through the "Pan-African period".[1] The Africans, they stress, pursue three major objectives: to strengthen national unity, further social reconstruction, and advance rapid economic growth. At the same time, however, they point to the danger of tribalism and religious rivalry, which play the role of centrifugal forces and serve as tools of the imperialist "divide and rule" policy.

As a social phenomenon, nationalism came into being in the colonial and dependent countries at the time, generally speaking, when capitalism in the industrially developed countries was entering its highest, imperialist stage. This period was distinguished by a new wave of national movements, but this time in other parts of the world—in the colonies and semi-colonies. The export of capital and the drawing of the colonies and semi-colonies into the world market led to the formation of capitalist relations, greatly accelerating the growth of national awareness and revolutionary liberation movements, of which nationalism became the ideological expression.

The fact that nationalism served as the embryo of the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle of the African peoples could not but leave a deep trace in the working masses. That is precisely why nationalism continues to play a very important role in the process of the widening socio-political struggle. "The bourgeois nationalism of *any* oppressed nation," Lenin wrote, "has a general democratic content ... and it is this content that we *unconditionally* support."[2]

Since nations are only just forming in many independent African countries, nationalism plays the role of a catalyser. The ideas of nationalism help strengthen the people's spiritual community, heighten interest in their historical past, infuse them with the feeling of national pride, give impetus to the development of national culture and literature, and stimulate the formation of national languages. Moreover, the enhancement of national awareness leads to the heightening of class consciousness, while the participation of the proletariat and its allies in the national liberation movement is good training for the

---

[1] *National Unity and Regionalism in Eight African States*, New York, 1966, p. 539.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 412.

future class battles. The formation of nations and the consolidation of independent national states take place in the struggle against imperialism and tribal and feudal divisions.

Two tendencies in the development of nationalism make themselves felt increasingly as the national liberation revolutions grow in scale and intensity and the task of socially reorganising the country is advanced. Nationalism is used not only by the revolutionary democratic forces but by local reactionaries too. The reason is the internal dialectic contradictoriness of nationalism which has both dynamic, progressive traits and conservative, negative aspects. The revolutionary democratic forces, which represent the progressive trend in the development of nationalism regard the formation of an independent national state as a prerequisite of their peoples' social, economic and cultural emancipation. The logic of struggle for genuine national regeneration leads the proponents of this tendency to the realisation that far-going social reforms must be carried out in close co-operation with all the revolutionary and progressive forces at home and abroad.

The demolition of colonial relations, social advancement and radical changes in socio-economic structures help gradually eliminate the objective causes for the existence of nationalism. And although the social and class tasks of the African national liberation revolution sometimes dissolve in national demands, and the struggle for the choice of the path is painted in all sorts of nationalistic colours, the general democratic tendencies inherent in the nationalism of an oppressed nation do not hamper the revolutionary democratic forces' transition to scientific socialism, and in certain conditions may even serve as a step forward. For, in the conditions where foreign imperialism predominates and the local bourgeoisie is weak, the national awareness of the oppressed, poverty-ridden and ignorant population is actually the elementary, spontaneous form of class consciousness. The enhancement of national awareness helps heighten class consciousness.

But besides the democratic trend, there is a reactionary one in nationalism. Its proponents seek to emasculate the general democratic content of nationalism, to use it in the interest of the classes and political groups which

oppose radical changes in the socio-economic structure of African countries. As far as they are concerned, achievement of state independence is an end in itself. Using nationalist slogans as a smoke screen, stirring up national hatred and preaching isolationism, these forces seek to divert the people's attention from the need to solve social problems. It is these forces that imperialism, which is doing everything to check the national liberation movement in Africa, is banking on.

The growth of nationalism is often used by bourgeois elements to deaden the working people's class consciousness, to create a "national chorus" in which one would hear only demands of a "national" character. The very idea of national unity is sometimes used by the ruling quarters to gloss over class contradictions, to relegate them into the background.

Speaking of nationalism and its role in the African peoples' anti-imperialist movement, one should draw attention to the following two facts.

First, the imperialist forces, having convinced themselves of the weak social basis of the reactionary forces supporting them in the African countries, are looking for new allies to help them emasculate the progressive content of nationalism and to use it in their interests. The British Professor K. R. Minogue, for instance, declares that the proponents of nationalism in Africa are the small social stratum of intellectuals and suggests that every support should be given those of them who favour integration and the extension of the influence of European bourgeois philosophy to African ideology. Until recently "the development of African nationalism took place primarily in Europe," he writes. "Congresses were held in a number of European cities; only after 1958 did it return to its purported homeland."[1] Hence the conclusion that "African nationalists are seeking, among other things, to Westernise their countries".[2]

Secondly, the growth of nationalism is attended, as a rule, by the growth of religious feelings, and this is often taken advantage of to whip up separatist, chauvinistic and even racialist sentiments. As the developments in the

---

[1] K. R. Minogue, *Nationalism*, London, 1967, p. 108.
[2] Ibid., p. 111.

Congo, Nigeria, Sudan and certain other countries have shown, the imperialists are giving every encouragement to these aspects of nationalism to split the anti-colonial forces and weaken the anti-imperialist front of the newly-free African nations.

The struggle of these two trends in nationalism reflects the class differentiation of forces over the question of the newly-free African countries' further development. Since nationalism is above all a social phenomenon, the answer to the question of which of these two trends will prevail depends on the concrete alignment of the class and political forces and the sharpness of the class struggle and the nature of the path chosen by the people.

Nationalism is a historically transient phenomenon. But, for the time being, there are in the present-day world and within the liberation movement itself, sufficiently numerous forces, strata of the population and politicians who, taking advantage of the nationalistic feelings of the bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie and certain segment of the working people, seek to check the movement or at least to use it to further their selfish aims. Interested for one reason or another in isolating the national liberation movement from the world socialist system and other revolutionary movements and in depriving it of its social-class content, they are trying to divert the liberation struggle of the oppressed nations into nationalist channels, to persuade the masses that it is the struggle of the poor nations against the rich. Championing of national dignity and national pride sometimes grows into advocacy of national isolation and even national exclusiveness. The appeals of the ideologists of nationalism to the national forces to unite in the struggle against imperialism as a rule go hand in hand with the negation of class differences and interests. They exclude the very possibility of posing the question about class interests and class struggle.

Although the ideology promoting the unity of the nation helps in these particular conditions to overcome tribal divisions and to consolidate the national anti-imperialist forces and, consequently, is progressive, nationalism nevertheless can turn into a factor splitting the national liberation movement and become reactionary if the progressive forces do not wage a resolute struggle against it.

Marxists-Leninists support the anti-imperialist trends of the nationalism of oppressed nations. But they have never renounced criticising the exclusiveness and other negative traits of nationalism or propagating the ideas of internationalism. Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism because it advances internationalism. Its principled policy is this: while helping to awaken the masses from feudal lethargy and supporting their struggle against national oppression and for national sovereignty, it stands for the most resolute and consistent democratism on all aspects of the national and colonial question. But, Lenin wrote, "this is the limit the proletariat can go to in supporting nationalism".[1] To go beyond that would be to support the bourgeoisie's efforts to fortify nationalism.

All the more so since the bourgeois elements are trying to use nationalism to impose the kinds of "national socialism" that would serve as cover for the essentially bourgeois development of the independent African states.

But there is also another tendency: the more the petty-bourgeois masses (peasants, urban middle strata, etc.) become convinced that the local bourgeoisie is incapable of carrying out the purportedly national programmes it has proclaimed, the closer they will approach the positions of scientific socialism.

In order properly to understand the nature of the socialist trends in Africa and the direction of their development, it is necessary to take the following internal factors into consideration: level of socio-economic development, alignment of class forces and political groupings, activity of masses, etc. Only a detailed analysis and all-round consideration of the internal processes in the given country will show in what direction this or that socialist trend is developing. Inadequate consideration of the internal factors sometimes leads to misinterpretation of socialism, to the effacement of the difference between the progressive nature of the undertaken measure and its socialist content. And this, in its turn, leads to the limitation of the criteria of socialism.

There are African liberation movement leaders who regard "development" and "socialism" as synonyms. Socio-economic measures (nationalisation, agrarian re-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 34.

form, establishment of public sector, etc.) may be very progressive and radical. But it is well known that their implementation does not automatically lead to socialism. Lenin wrote: "The dialectical process of development really does intrude elements of the new society, elements both material and spiritual, even under capitalism. But socialists should be able to distinguish the part from the whole; they should demand the *whole* in their slogan, and not a part; they must contrapose to bits of patchwork, which often divert fighters from the truly revolutionary path, the basic prerequisites for a real revolution."[1]

The thing is to take into account the sum total of socio-economic measures, the nature of state power, the level of development of the productive forces, and all other socio-economic and political factors.

The petty-bourgeois, and especially the peasant masses, in the developing African countries whose interests and views are expressive of the socialist trends represented by revolutionary democratic parties, are being drawn more and more into the whirlpool of class contradictions due to the intensification of the class struggle following the achievement of political independence. But they are not yet ready, as a rule, to tackle these contradictions and still less to resolve them from the class positions of scientific socialism. They are still under the sway of the nationalistic forms of ideology into which they seek to infuse a new, democratic and at times non-capitalist content. Hence the eclectic, inconsistent and contradictory character of socialist trends in practical activity and particularly in the sphere of theory. But the fact that many present-day socialist conceptions are inconsistent, contradictory and eclectic does not mean that their proponents in the new African countries should be "excommunicated" from socialism.

Whenever any leader of the national liberation movement in Africa sincerely strives to direct his country's development along the socialist lines, he is given every support by the democratic and revolutionary forces. That is why attempts to represent scientific socialism as its antipode and claims that Marxists-Leninists wholly negate the socialist aspirations of the national patriotic forces

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 371-72.

look clumsy, to say the least. One such attempt was made by Fenner Brockway, member of the British Labour Party, in his book *African Socialism*. "The Marxists-Leninists," he wrote, "come into conflict with the general socialist flow in Africa because they insist that their 'scientific socialism' is authoritative under all conditions and that its theory and method must be universally accepted."[1]

The specific historical, national and socio-economic conditions in the developing African countries enable them to introduce much that is new and original into the forms and methods of implementing socialist principles. This naturally does not mean that it is enough for a social trend to call itself socialist to be one. It is necessary to distinguish between the tendency and the fact. It is in the interest of the struggle for the social and national liberation of the African peoples, in the interest of scientific socialism to wage an irreconcilable ideological struggle against the forces which seek to camouflage capitalist development with socialist slogans. It is also necessary to criticise constructively and in a friendly manner the erroneous theories which may defer the victory of socialism, lead to the loss of opportunities in carrying out revolutionary socialist reforms, and entail heavy sacrifice and privations.

The specific conditions obtaining in the developing African countries introduce much that is new into creative Marxism but do not cancel out the basic laws of socialism. Marxists-Leninists consider it their duty to explain the general nature of scientific socialism to the masses, to find ways and means of co-operating with the different socialist movements, to support all that is progressive and all those who, consciously or unconsciously making theoretical mistakes, advance to socialism, who sincerely wish to achieve it but who, for one reason or another, cannot wholly embrace scientific socialism. Marxists-Leninists would like to induce honest proponents of socialism, who reject the capitalist path of development for their countries, to make two steps forward where they plan to make only one. The logic and experience of class struggle show that real revolutionaries will gradually

[1] Fenner Brockway, *African Socialism*, London, 1963, p. 20.

embrace scientific socialism. Today, when Marxist-Leninist ideology has prevailed in the world, the principles of scientific socialism can actively influence different social trends, including the socialist trends in the newly-free African countries.

AFRICA AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE TWO SYSTEMS

The newly-independent African states occupy a special place in the world. Although they have not fully broken out of the world capitalist economic system, most of them are no longer part of the imperialists' state political system. A big influence on the development of the emergent African countries is exerted and will be exerted by the international situation, the alignment of class forces in the world, and the competition of the two social systems. The future of Africa depends considerably on which of the two world social systems—socialism or capitalism—will succeed in decisively influencing its socio-economic and political development. As the African countries advance along the path of progress, their influence on world development will grow.

Realising that Africa is playing an increasingly important role in international affairs, the imperialist powers, and particularly the United States, are using political, economic and ideological means of pressure to persuade the African countries that their salvation lies in their friendship with the Western countries, that they should consequently follow the same path as the developed capitalist countries. This is the aim pursued by the book *The Reds and the Blacks*, written by William Attwood, former US Ambassador to Kenya and Guinea. Before John F. Kennedy's election, he writes, the United States paid very little attention to the "awakening African giant". Here is what he wrote: "Our policy, if you could call it one, was still to tailor our actions in Africa to the wishes of our often short-sighted NATO partners."[1] Now, he says, the time calls for action because the situation in Africa favours it: new leaders are appearing, people who act instead of talking, people whose activity is rather pro-

[1] William Attwood, *The Reds and the Blacks. A Personal Adventure*, London, 1967, p. 16.

African than anti-Western. They need help and welcome advice.

One can say more or less the same about Rupert Emerson's *Africa and United States Policy*, in which this American scholar of international affairs urges the United States to pay attention to Africa primarily from the point of view of political strategy. "It may well be," he writes, "that the greatest potential military significance of Africa for the United States is neither the strength of its armed forces nor its utility as a base of operations and source of supply but the danger that racial or Cold War complications might cause the involvement of American forces on the continent as they have already become involved in Korea and Vietnam."[1]

But however much Emerson may affirm that there is no occasion for any sharp divergence of interest between the United States and African countries, he is ultimately forced to admit that "African-American relations are bound to be rendered difficult and touchy by the basic contrast between American wealth, power, advancement, and attachment to private enterprise on the one side and African poverty, weakness, backwardness, and attachment to socialism on the other."[2]

While they do not pin all their hopes on the political and economic methods of influence, the imperialists resort on an increasing scale to means of ideological pressure on the independent African nations.

The experienced and predatory monopoly bourgeoisie manoeuvres, alters tactics, discards the old methods of propaganda which have little effect today and elaborates new "arguments" and a new approach that better suit the fast changing conditions. There is a whole system of measures being worked out in the imperialist countries to weaken the influence democratic and socialist ideas have in Africa and ideologically ensure that the emergent African states remain within the world capitalist system. Imperialism is especially hostile towards countries with progressive regimes. It seeks to push them off from their chosen road, hamper the development of progressive trends

---

[1] Rupert Emerson, *Africa and United States Policy*, Englewood Cliffs, 1967, p. 31.

[2] Ibid., p. 99.

in the African liberation movement, and prevent advanced African countries from taking the path of social progress.

Professor John S. Gibson, noted American bourgeois ideologist, writes that "because of the war for the minds of men in which we find ourselves today, the impact of ideologies on the lives of all of us is stronger than ever".[1] And so he proposes that in their political relations with the developing countries the United States and other imperialist powers should pursue a more cautious and subtle policy, refrain from openly imposing the ideology of capitalism upon them and to draw them into it gradually.

Bourgeois ideologues are trying to persuade public opinion in the imperialist countries that the development of the African revolution does not jeopardise capitalism as a social system. What is more, they are using their favourite weapons—anti-communism and bourgeois nationalism—in the hope that they will help them revive old bankrupt conceptions on African soil and contrapose them to the idea of the revolutionary democratic regeneration of the world. Being well aware of the popularity of socialist ideas in the African countries, bourgeois ideologues resort to every possible means to disparage the Soviet Union's socialist experience, to depict socialism as a purely "European model" that is unsuitable for Africa.

Despite all their efforts, the imperialists have not succeeded in checking the advance of the African peoples' national liberation movement, in forcing it back. Nevertheless, the danger presented to this region by the aggressive policy of imperialism should not be underestimated. It is still liable to cause a great deal of suffering and grief to the African nations.

There are signs of qualitatively new and irreversible progressive changes in Africa's national liberation movement. One major development of the African national liberation revolution is the rejection of the capitalist path by a number of new states. New forces are emerging in the national liberation movement, the anti-imperialist struggle is now led by progressive countries that have taken the non-capitalist path of development in close alliance with the world socialist system.

---

[1] John S. Gibson, *Ideology and World Affairs*, Boston, 1964, p. 12.

More and more people in Africa are coming to realise that to take the path of social progress means to advance to socialism in close alliance with the countries that have already established this system—a system based on social justice in which there is no oppression of nations or exploitation of man by man. One big achievement of the forces of national and social liberation is the choice of the socialist path by a number of the newly-free African states, which have already scored successes in the implementation of far-reaching socio-economic reforms. Progressive African countries—Egypt, Tanzania, Somalia, Libya and others—are contributing to the development of the national liberation movement and confirming in practice Lenin's thesis that the nations breaking out of colonial bondage in our day can take the path of social progress without going through the capitalist stage. One of the prerequisites for this is their co-operation with the socialist countries.

The world socialist system—the greatest achievement of the international working class, its creation—is the main revolutionary force of our day. The countries of this system have become the bulwark on which all the peoples fighting for their national and social liberation can safely rely. The socialist countries are solving complex problems relating to economic development, establishment and consolidation of new social relations, moulding of the new man. The successful solution of these problems strengthens the international position of socialism, enhances the force of attraction of socialist ideas throughout the world, and creates favourable conditions for the upswing of the world liberation movement.

The countries of victorious socialism exert influence on the world revolutionary process chiefly by their economic policy, by the force of example. "The contribution of the world socialist system to the common cause of the anti-imperialist forces is determined primarily by its growing economic potential," the Communist and Workers' Parties said at their Moscow conference in 1969. "The swift economic development of the countries belonging to the socialist system at rates outpacing the economic growth of the capitalist countries, the advance of socialism to leading positions in a number of fields of scientific and technological progress, and the blazing of a trail into outer space

by the Soviet Union—all these tangible results, produced by the creative endeavours of the peoples of the socialist countries, decisively contribute to the preponderance of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism over imperialism."[1]

The socialist countries, rapidly increasing their industrial and agricultural production, consider it their internationalist duty to make full use of the advantages of the socialist system in order jointly to fulfil the historic task of outpacing the world capitalist system in the absolute volume of industrial and agricultural production and then to surpass the economically most developed countries in per capita output and living standards.

World socialism does not export revolution to other countries. The victorious proletariat does not wish to impose its kind of happiness on other peoples. But it is also firmly opposed to the export of counter-revolution, to the imperialist countries' attempts to quash the peoples' national liberation struggle by force of arms. The world socialist system has adequate means to prevent the imperialists from carrying out their predatory plans. Knowing that imperialism has not renounced its plans of waging colonial wars, the Soviet Union and other socialist states are giving substantial military assistance to the newly-free African countries, supplying them with modern weapons. Especially important is their assistance to the fighting peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Namibia and South Africa who are inflicting heavy blows upon the imperialist-backed alliance of fascist and racist regimes and paving the way to new, important victories for the African revolution.

Speaking of the socialist countries' assistance to the anti-imperialist forces of Africa, Chairman John B. Marks of the South African Communist Party said at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in June 1969 that "they have rendered and are rendering valuable practical support to our freedom fighters: money, food, clothing, medicines, assistance in military training and—most precious—arms. We take this opportunity, Comrades, in the presence of the leaders of

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, p. 22.

the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Mongolia, Cuba and other socialist countries, to say that our people will never forget the warm comradely solidarity they have shown in providing us with the means for our emancipation."[1]

The Soviet Government from the very first declared itself firmly opposed to imperialism and colonialism, to aggression and predatory wars, for peace and international friendship. It rejected and condemned the policy of blackmail, violence and threats, and proposed in its stead a policy of respect for the equality, independence and sovereignty of all nations. The socialist countries, and especially the Soviet Union, help the African nations both to win political independence and to develop their economy and achieve economic independence.

At present they are helping the developing countries build about 2,500 projects. When commissioned, they will produce more than twice as much steel as they did in 1960, increase the capacity of their oil-refining enterprises by 130 per cent and the output of electric power by a third, and irrigate an additional 1.5 million hectares of land.[2]

Considerable assistance to the newly-independent African countries is rendered by the Soviet Union. About 70 per cent of the credits it grants them goes to build their industry. Dozens of industrial enterprises have been or are being built in the African countries with Soviet help.

Of much value to the developing countries is the assistance given them by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in training specialists for them. Over 150,000 skilled workers and technical specialists have been trained by Soviet specialists at construction sites in the developing countries, and about 35,000 have done or are doing practical work at Soviet enterprises. It should be stressed that, working side by side with the workers of socialist countries, the workers of the developing African countries come to learn by experience the real strength of the workers' international solidarity.

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, p. 668.

[2] *World Socialism and Developing Countries*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 15-16.

The Soviet Union has helped many African countries to build or establish colleges, technical schools, secondary schools and educational centres, and widely opened the doors of its higher educational establishments to Africans. The Patrice Lumumba University, opened in Moscow in 1960, trains specialists in all branches of science and technology for many developing countries, including African.

What distinguishes the assistance given by the socialist states to developing countries is that it is directed towards developing the most important branches of their economy, putting an end to their economic and political dependence on the imperialist powers and raising living standards. They consider it one of their foreign policy tasks to help and support the new national states. The CPSU regards fraternal alliance with the nations that have broken out of the colonial and semi-colonial fetters as one of the cornerstones of its immutable foreign policy. This alliance is based on the community of vital interests of world socialism and the world national liberation movement. The Soviet Communist Party deems it its internationalist duty to help all the peoples striving to win and consolidate their independence, all the peoples fighting to destroy the colonial system.

The existence of the world socialist system, the growth of its economic potential and its tangible successes in the economic competition with capitalism create excellent conditions for the newly-free African countries to eliminate their economic and social backwardness. It is already possible for them to make use of the technological experience accumulated by the socialist states, to acquire modern machinery and equipment, and, what is especially important, to get them in exchange for their own goods.

Bourgeois ideologues are doing their best to distort the purport of and belittle the significance of the assistance rendered by the socialist states to the newly-independent countries. At the same time they laud the "aid" given the latter by the imperialist powers and claim that these powers are not interested in exploiting the economically backward countries. American economist John Pincus, for instance, affirms that the prosperity of the West does not depend in any significant way on the fate of the developing countries. It depends first and foremost on their own home

markets and the development of economic ties between the developed countries themselves. Pincus denies that the Western capitalist countries became prosperous by exploiting and pauperising economically backward nations. But in the end he is forced to admit that in the long run, say, fifty years from now, the "aid" given the emergent countries may well bring considerable profits to the industrially developed states.[1]

Some bourgeois authors tie economic aid to the developing countries to the activity of international associations which foster the interests of the imperialist powers. One of them is American economist James H. Weaver who affirms that the International Development Association's credits to the developing countries are "designed to give the best economic returns," that "politics are ignored" and that "the World Bank has no politics".[2] From the economic and political point of view, he claims, aid given through international organisations is far more effective than that rendered on a bilateral basis. Weaver admits that the developing countries are wary of the aid given directly by the United States because they are afraid of becoming dependent on it. International capitalist organisations, in his opinion, have the advantage of being able to approach the tasks of the economic development of any one country more broadly and to insist on the economic policy it should follow without fearing that they will be accused of impinging upon the country's sovereignty. The capitalists have come to realise, Weaver says, that it is in their own interest to raise people's living standards because that will mean bigger sales of goods and bigger profits (the best example in this connection, in his opinion, is Henry Ford II). Weaver seeks to persuade his reader that the present-day monopolists are less concerned about the possibility of the newly-free developing countries breaking out of the capitalist system than about the "transfer" of wealth from the industrially developed capitalist countries to the developing ones.[3]

---

[1] John Pincus, *Trade, Aid and Development. The Rich and Poor Nations*, New York, 1967, p. 40.

[2] James H. Weaver, *The International Development Association. A New Approach to Foreign Aid.* New York, Washington, London, 1965, p. 78.

[3] Ibid., p. 223.

But the newly-independent nations have amassed quite a bit of experience in their struggle against neo-colonialism. They know now what the honeyed statements of neo-colonialist politicians and ideologues really conceal; they oppose neo-colonialism and promote closer economic and trade relations with socialist countries.

The Soviet Union has always regarded development of economic ties with and assistance to the newly-independent countries as a task of paramount importance serving further to strengthen the international anti-imperialist front.

The socialist states' policy towards the developing countries is predetermined by the nature of socialist society, in which there is no exploitation of man by man and no capitalists whose sole aim is to make profits. This policy is based on the principles of internationalism, friendship and brotherhood of nations. Close alliance and co-operation between the Soviet Union and African countries is predicated upon their community of interests in the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, for national liberation and social progress.

In 1921 the Soviet Government headed by Lenin issued a statement which stated *inter alia*: "Our Eastern policy is diametrically different from the Eastern policy of the imperialist countries. Our Eastern policy favours the independent economic and political development of the Eastern nations and will give them every support in this. We consider it our role and mission to be natural and devoted friends and allies of the nations striving for fully independent economic and political development."[1] The Soviet Union has firmly abided by this Leninist principle all along.

Socialist countries help the newly-independent states to overcome as quickly as possible their economic and social backwardness, build up their economy and culture, and raise the standard of living. Economic, scientific and technical co-operation between socialist and developing countries is based on the principles of equality, respect of each other's sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. This often forces the imperialists to make substantial concessions to the developing countries.

[1] *Kommunistichesky Internatsional* No. 3, 1922, p. 1029.

The development of the productive forces and the growth of the defence potential of the socialist states make it possible to force the imperialists to accept the policy of peaceful coexistence and to prevent another world war.

In a world divided into two opposing social systems, the principle of peaceful coexistence is the only correct and rational principle of international relations. There are some who affirm that the principle of peaceful coexistence means renunciation of revolutionary struggle and deliberately distort the fact that the coexistence of states with differing social systems, being an effective form of class struggle in the international arena, creates favourable conditions—as shown by development—for the intensification of revolutionary struggle all along the anti-imperialist front.

It is in the conditions of peaceful coexistence that imperialism's colonial system disintegrated and the international working-class and national liberation movement began to gain scope. Peaceful coexistence, consequently, does not mean "adaptation to imperialism" or "ideological coexistence". It is a new stage in the development of class struggle—economic, political and ideological—between two social systems, between labour and capital, between the oppressed and the oppressors.

The aim of the policy of peaceful coexistence is to frustrate international provocations and hamper the export of counterrevolution, to create the most favourable conditions possible for the nations to exercise their sacred right to run their own affairs. The slogan of peaceful coexistence does not lull the masses, as some Peking theorists claim, but helps activate them and mobilise their efforts for the solution of the urgent problems of social development.

There can of course be no question of peaceful coexistence where the internal processes of class and national liberation struggle in the capitalist countries and remaining colonies are concerned. This principle is inapplicable to relations between the oppressors and the oppressed, between the colonialists and the peoples waging a struggle, with or without arms, for their freedom or in its defence.

With each new victory scored by the socialist countries

in their economic competition with capitalism the pressure on the positions of imperialism increases, forcing it to make one concession after another, and better conditions are created for the world liberation movement. Witnessing the economic competition of the two world systems—capitalism and socialism, the newly-free African countries logically come to the conclusion that socialism is the superior system. On their path to socialist development, these countries will naturally have to go through the historical phases of social progress in which the material and socio-political prerequisites of socialism will gradually be created. A bitter struggle for the future is now being fought in these countries by the progressive and the imperialist-supported reactionary forces.

The existence of the world socialist system exerts great ideological influence on the national liberation movement in Africa, greatly speeding up the formation of progressive views among its participants, above all among the workers. One of the most important results of this influence is the widespread dissemination of the ideas of scientific socialism.

An exceptionally big role in the popularisation of scientific socialism in the colonial and dependent countries is being played by the Communist and Workers' parties, whose emergence vastly stimulated the activity of the national liberation forces and the growth of the masses' political awareness.

The numerical and organisational weakness of the working class, almost total illiteracy, strong tribal, caste, religious and nationalistic survivals and prejudices, the repressive colonial regime—all this seriously complicated the dissemination of revolutionary ideas in the colonies and semicolonies. It required enormous courage and indomitable belief in the righteousness of one's cause to propagate Marxist-Leninist ideas, which illumine for the oppressed nations the road to freedom, in difficult underground conditions and in the face of constant persecution.

The Communists' role of guiding force became especially manifest in the years immediately before their countries' acquisition of political independence. It was then that they showed that they were the most consistent and staunch champions of national independence.

Lenin attached immense importance to the elaboration

of the ideological and organisational principles for the communist movement in the colonial and dependent countries. He regarded the Communists as a force destined to establish contact between the working and exploited masses of these countries and the international proletariat, "to arouse the working masses to revolutionary activity, to independent action and to organisation, regardless of the level they have reached; to translate the true communist doctrine, which was intended for the Communists of the more advanced countries, into the language of every people; to carry out those practical tasks which must be carried out immediately, and to join the proletarians of other countries in a common struggle".[1]

The African Marxists can claim merit for being the bearers and propagandists of socialist ideas in the colonial world, ideas that are today being adopted by the progressive national democratic forces. At their meeting in Moscow in 1969, the Communist and Workers' Parties stressed that the Communists "fight for the freedom, national independence and socialist future of their peoples. They are bearers of the ideas of scientific socialism and fight in the vanguard of the national liberation movement. This movement, the social progress of the peoples in the newly liberated countries demand close co-operation between the Communist and Workers' Parties and the other patriotic and progressive forces. A hostile attitude to communism and persecution of Communists harm the struggle for national and social emancipation."[2]

The communist movement in the colonial and dependent countries was born and grew in specific and complicated conditions. In their difficult struggle for the workers' interests there have been shortcomings and mistakes, some due to the underestimation of the revolutionary potentialities of the national and petty bourgeoisie, disregard for the national factors and national demands, confusion of two types of revolution—national liberation and socialist, and so on. The Communists do not hush up the weaknesses of their movement. They openly criticise them in order to eliminate them quickly and radically.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

[2] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Moscow, 1969*, p. 29.

They firmly rebuff the attempts of the bourgeois ideologues to characterise the history of the communist movement in the colonial and dependent countries as a sequence of errors. One of the most widespread "arguments" advanced by the anti-Communists is the claim that the appearance of Communist Parties in the economically and socially backward countries is "historically unjustified" and that, consequently, they are a "foreign body", the result of "open interference" by the international communist forces.

The formation of Communist Parties there had specific features, of course. But their appearance is a completely law-governed and objective process made possible by the existence of social forces capable of assimilating and implementing the ideas and principles of scientific socialism and communism. As Lenin stressed time and again, these ideas and principles "are understood and immediately applicable, not only in the industrially developed countries, not only in those which have a social basis like the proletariat, but also in those which have the peasantry as their basis".[1]

There is nothing the Communists cherish more than the basic aims of social development. To promote them they form political alliances with all progressive national democratic forces, without making their leadership of the united front against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism their main condition for participation in it. The Communists support any progressive measure, whoever may propose it, if it will strengthen national independence and ensure social progress. They highly appreciate and sincerely back the progressive socio-economic reforms undertaken by the ruling revolutionary democratic parties in African countries. At the same time they criticise the forces which hamper or deliberately procrastinate with progressive measures in the interest of the people, refuse to co-operate with the forces dedicated to the revolution and seek to prevent them from taking part in public affairs on one pretext or another.

The Communists—and in this they fundamentally differ from bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties—not only advance really substantiated programmes of joint action

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 490.

but strive for their fulfilment within the national democratic government if they are represented in it and without it if they are not. One of their main demands is for the expansion and consolidation of democracy which they regard as an important element of the struggle for socialism.

The African Marxists face complex problems. They have to adapt Marxist theory and practice to the difficult and specific conditions obtaining on the continent, to the kind of conditions Europe has not known. In the process of propagating the ideas of scientific socialism in these conditions they have to wage a struggle to preserve the purity of Marxism-Leninism, to prevent its distortion in any way. They have to fight both against revisionism, which is seeking to emasculate the militant revolutionary content of the proletarian doctrine in the interest of bourgeois ideology, and against dogmatism, which is trying to fetter Marxism with dead schemes and fosters sectarianism and Leftist adventurism.

If the bourgeois elements refuse to co-operate and if they impose on the revolutionaries their own nationalistic ideology as the only acceptable and possible one, and thus claim monopoly on ideological leadership and suppress all opposition, there can of course be no question of real co-operation. What we have in this particular case is self-exposure of the class narrow-mindedness of bourgeois nationalism, a manifestation of the extreme weakness and instability of this general democratic element in its overall content.

The present-day conditions make it imperative to intensify ideological activity within the national liberation movement. Criticism is rightly spearheaded against the ideologists of imperialism. The more actively the revolutionary forces influence the development of progressive views among the masses, including the national democratic forces, the more successful the dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the African countries and the adoption of the socialist world outlook will be.

Success in the struggle on the ideological front depends to a large extent on the ability of the revolutionary forces to win over as many people as possible, people who are their natural allies in this struggle in general and in certain of its aspects—representatives of the petty bour-

geoisie, intermediate urban strata, anti-imperialist national bourgeoisie, intellectuals and, of course, the segments of the working people who are still in the grip of the reactionary ideas of bourgeois nationalism and anti-communism and have wrong notions about contemporary problems.

As regards those who are seeking an alliance with scientific socialism and are moving, though slowly and often spontaneously, in this direction, the true revolutionary forces are ready to meet them half-way, if the situation permits and if this does not militate against the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Tactful attitude towards people who have not yet overcome bourgeois and, in some countries, feudal prejudices and merciless exposure of the ideologues of anti-communism are a matter of principle for Marxism-Leninism.

The unity of all the progressive, anti-imperialist forces within the national liberation movement and their close alliance with the other revolutionary and democratic movements of our day are one of the prerequisites of the newly-independent states' advance along the path to complete national liberation and social progress. The earnest of success of the African revolution lies in the active participation of the masses, and especially the growing working class, in the administration of society, in the working class' alliance with the peasantry, in the all-round promotion of democracy, and in the support given the African revolution by world socialism and the international working-class movement.

The deeper the ideas of scientific socialism penetrate into African minds, the more successful the African revolution will be and the greater the achievements of the peoples of this fighting continent on the path to genuine national independence and social progress.